

Improving COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY Teaching

FEB 23 1961

PERIODICAL ROOM

Editorial:

The Editor's Uneasy Chair
Doctor of Philosophy

- Creative Teaching.....Frederick Mayer
University of Redlands
- Inservice Development of Instructors.....John R. Sala
United States Air Force Academy
- Adjustment vs. Intellectual Achievement.....Joseph R. Royce
University of Redlands
- Some Notes on Teaching Education Courses.....Joseph Justman
Brooklyn College
- First Day and Last Day.....Robert L. Coard
University of Alabama
- Perspective by Participation.....James O. Buswell III
Wheaton College
- Creative Logic in Freshman Composition....Walter J. De Mordaunt
New Mexico State University
- Professor, Let's Get That Book.....Daniel A. Seager
Colorado State College
- Should College Students Help in Schools?.....George Beecher
Goddard College
- Could We Cut Costs the Soviet Way?.....Chester S. Williams
University of Oklahoma

Graduate Schools and Teaching

A Review by E. D. Duryea

OTHER NEW BOOKS

SEVENTH YEAR

SPRING 1960

VOL. VIII, No. 2

EIGHTH YEAR

Improving College and University Teaching

INTERNATIONAL QUARTERLY JOURNAL
FEATURING ARTICLES ON COLLEGE TEACHING
WRITTEN BY COLLEGE TEACHERS

Editor: DELMER M. GOODE

Publisher: *The Graduate School
Oregon State College
Corvallis, Oregon*

EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD

- Lloyd E. Blanch.....Assistant Commissioner for Higher Education, U. S. Office of Education
Lawrence H. Chamberlain.....Professor of Political Science, Columbia University
W. H. Cowley.....David Jacks Professor of Higher Education, Stanford University
Bernice Brown Cronkhite.....Vice President, Radcliffe College
Edwin D. Duryea.....Dean of the Evening Program, Hofstra College
Winslow R. Hatch.....Research Coordinator (Higher Education), U. S. Office of Education
Joseph Justman.....Professor of Education, Brooklyn College
William Charles Korfmacher.....Professor of Classical Languages, Saint Louis University
Wilbert J. McKeachie.....Associate Professor of Psychology, University of Michigan
Walter H. Mais.....Professor of Physics, Dean of the Faculty, Brooklyn College
Max S. Marshall.....Professor of Microbiology, University of California Medical Center
Ordway Tead.....Member of Board of Higher Education, New York City; Treasurer, Briarcliff College

GRADUATE SCHOOL

- George W. Gleeson.....Dean of the School of Engineering
Henry P. Hansen.....Dean of the Graduate School
J. Kenneth Munford.....Professor of English and Higher Education
Frank L. Parks.....Associate Professor of Sociology
Franklin R. Zeran.....Dean of the School of Education

Entered as second-class matter, March 22, 1954, at the Post Office at Corvallis, Oregon, under the Act of August 24, 1912.

Copyright © 1960 by Oregon State College

Subscription price
\$2.00 a year
Two years \$3.50

Address: 10 Commerce Hall
Oregon State College
Corvallis, Oregon

The Editor's Uneasy Chair

Some blind men, encountering an elephant, undertook to discover what he was like by touching him. When they compared their observations they were bewildered. One, who had felt the ele-

Blind leaders
of the blind?

phant's side, reported that he was like a wall, one who had touched a leg described him as like a pillar, one who had touched an ear said it was like a blowing fan, and one who had touched the tail said it was like sugar cane. The Buddha's purpose in telling this story is one thing; its significance for college and university teaching is something else.

Is not the teacher himself often a blind man who knows only what he has touched—leg, ear, tail, or whatever—and expounds it with meticulous detail to students who are equally blind, learning only the partial data that the professor knows? Is not what we call the professor's specialty really only a leg or an ear, some aspect of which we call a course? The students, prudently learning enough to please the professor, learn little or nothing about the whole elephant, and many do not care to.

We say that, since human knowledge has become so vast, no one can be expected to comprehend it but can only master his portion and teach it. But just as the leg of an elephant cannot be understood apart from the whole animal, a subject must be taught in context. Unicellular or multicellular organisms must be seen in the organic world and its evolution. American colonial times demand a setting in historical origins and subsequent events, not merely American but human in general. A fact we cannot escape is that we must not teach only in terms of dissected specimens disregarding of the organism itself, of organisms without thought of their ecology, and similarly in all the aspects, concrete and general, of human knowledge and culture.

Wholes are not mere totals of parts. Parts are but aspects of wholes.

Fortunate are the few who see their subject in its full relationships and so teach it. They are of that elite who see life clearly and see it whole. Unhappy are we if, blind in our specialties, we pursue knowledge without meaning and teach it to students without understanding.

DMG

"Doctor of Philosophy"

WHAT does it mean to be a "Doctor of Philosophy"? It is one's credential as a scholar. It is the professional "union card." But what does it mean? The degree is solemnly conferred, in impressive ceremony. Would its dignity and prestige be enhanced if more thought were taken of its literal and symbolic significance?

An academic "doctor" in the modern sense is one versed in a department of knowledge, but a Ph.D. is not necessarily (or often) versed in philosophy. He will be versed in chemistry or history or microbiology. As for philosophy, most Ph.D.'s, if they think about it at all, bear their title with some misgiving because they may never have even studied philosophy.

Both "doctor" and "philosophy" nevertheless have an aura that derives from the past and merits increased consideration in the present. "Doctor" like "master" once meant *teacher* and philosophy meant *love of wisdom*. From this latter concept were derived the terms philosopher and philosopher, a Philosopher being a lover of wisdom, in distinction from the less humble Sophists, self-styled "wise men."

In the ancient sense a modern professor, if he loves wisdom, may unabashedly think of himself as a philosopher even though he has little or no knowledge of the discipline known as philosophy. But if Doctor of Philosophy means, as in some measure it assuredly should, teacher of philosophy, the professor has his misgivings back again.

Is not the problem readily resolved by taking Doctor of Philosophy to signify "teacher of the love of wisdom"? Accep-

tance by the professor of the responsibility to teach the love of wisdom would enrich and perhaps revolutionize college and university teaching. It would clarify the fact that teaching is not mere transmission of knowledge and skills. These often can be transmitted in other, perhaps more effective

ways than what we ordinarily call teaching. (Teaching machines are in use.)

The teacher of the love of wisdom becomes a maker of men, of men who love wisdom. He sees his specialty and his scholarly knowledge of it, his experience in it, his enthusiasm for it, as a means of inducing in his students not only knowledge but understanding, appreciation, and zeal in its pursuit.

The place of the specialty is in no way diminished, but rather heightened. The professor teaches the subject he knows, but he puts it in relationship to all knowl-

edge, to human life, to the universe. He relates it to the individual life of the student, his needs, interests, talents, and potentialities.

In the medieval universities philosophy signified the whole body of knowledge. Under holistic conceptions this is a noble meaning still.

Let no professor ever disparage his doctoral title. It is in truth a commission. It links him with the past and the future of human culture and civilization and obligates him to hold aloft the torch of the love of wisdom, of that learning that is more than the facts and concepts of a single subject but rather the vision of values and meaning, the true higher learning.

DMG

The True Philosophers

"O my dear Simmias, is there not one true coin for which all things ought to exchange?—and that is wisdom; and only in exchange for this, and in company with this, is anything truly bought and sold, whether courage or temperance or justice. And is not all true virtue the companion of wisdom? . . . I conceive that the founders of the mysteries had a real meaning when they intimated in a figure long ago that he who passed unsanctified and uninitiated into the world below will live in a slough, but that he who arrives there after initiation and purification will dwell with the gods. For 'many,' as they say in the mysteries, 'are the thyraus bearers, but few are the mystics,' meaning, as I interpret the words, the true philosophers."

Socrates in PLATO: *Dialogues*

Creative Teaching

Author of a dozen books (see review of his "Education for Creative Living" in the Winter issue), and more than 150 articles, Dr. Mayer, professor of philosophy in the humanities at the University of Redlands, has contributed to earlier issues of this journal. Dr. Benjamin Fine has called Frederick Mayer "one of the most brilliant thinkers of our time" and an outstanding spokesman of current educational thinking. The following article was written especially for this journal.

By **FREDERICK MAYER**

A GREAT TEACHER is a dramatist of ideas. He builds the bridge between the world of reality and the world of our dreams. He makes the past as vivid as the present. He lives not in any period of history, for his home is the universe. The biases and prejudices of which so many suffer do not touch him, for he has learned to view life with detachment.

This is an ideal portrait. Many teachers are fragmentary human beings. They suffer frequently from the limitations of their time. Thus a noted professor of physics refused to accept the new quantum theory; it just was not physics. Wilamowitz, a famous philologist, refused to believe in the genius of Nietzsche, who, he thought, was unscholarly. In the United States, William James, one of our most brilliant teachers, was regarded with suspicion by academic thinkers who thought that his ideas were too popular and that he was not profound enough in his philosophical system.

Teachers frequently have compromised with the social system of their time. Hegel proved the superiority of the German state. Gentile was a loyal follower of Mussolini. Heidegger, as rector of Freiburg, supported the doctrines of Hitlerism. Even in democratic nations, in times of crisis, thinkers have become victims of hysteria.

Teaching thus is basically an existential process. It reflects the personality, outlook, ideals, and background of the instructor who, though he may claim to be objective, in reality represents the spirit of his time, what the Germans call the *Zeitgeist*.

A great teacher will not only know his subject, he will radiate it. To a brilliant French teacher, the study of language is something more than the study of grammar. It becomes the study of the

soul of a nation. To a scientist who is dedicated to his work, science becomes an avenue to truth and the foundation of progress. To an artist, like Neutra or Wright, architecture is not just an ornamental expression of man; rather it becomes an introduction to his innermost physiological and spiritual needs. To a poet, like Frost, poetry is not merely a lyrical expression, but man's encounter with a timeless reality.

Any student who is fortunate to have such teachers will feel that knowledge ennobles and elevates and that it overcomes all separateness and dualism. Knowledge thus gives not merely power, but a justification for existence.

A great teacher is never a mere technician. For example, when we listen to the ideas of Neutra we learn not only about architecture but about society, physics, politics, ethics, and biology. When Oppenheimer lectures, he may touch upon philosophy and Zen Buddhism, as well as upon relativity and nuclear physics. Rutherford, the great English physicist, was an expert in contemporary literature. Whitehead was at home in higher mathematics as well as in the latest theory of poetic criticism. Since a great teacher is in an unending state of self-discovery, he can never stand still and thus he communicates a sense of excitement to the student.

A mediocre historian will only see the facts and statistics of history. A profound historian, like James Harvey Robinson, will see history as a cultural story in which man's mind evolved and was released from the bondage of superstition and rationalization. When Beard lectured about American civilization, it became like a dramatic play. When Frankfurter at Harvard discussed constitutional history he influenced a generation of lawyers with his concepts of social justice.

AT SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, few will forget B. A. G. Fuller, the noted historian of philosophy, who could make Greek thought as vivid as modern times. A skeptic and a naturalist, Fuller poked fun at convention, especially at puritanism.

At Boston University, Brightman had a different view from Fuller's, for Brightman was a personalist who felt that the universe has a spiritual purpose. Utterly dedicated to his students, he took a strong interest in all of them. After classes he would spend hours with them discussing their problems and their philosophy of life.

At Harvard University, Ulich in philosophy of education attracted international attention. A convinced believer in freedom, he fled from the tyranny of National Socialism and he came over here certain that culture could only flourish in a democratic society. An idealist, like Kant and Emerson, Ulich pointed the responsibilities of the teacher who to him was "the guardian of society." His students received more than severe academic training and the inspiration of profound scholarship. They obtained a vision of living greatness, and were in contact with a man who never stood still in his intellectual development.

Northrop at Yale became one of the noted attractions of his university. In his *Meeting of East and West*, he demonstrated his encyclopedic knowledge and he showed that philosophy has a universal meaning. Interested both in the physical and social sciences, an expert in logic, and a student of Asiatic thought, Northrup communicated real intellectual excitement in his seminars.

Schneider at Columbia made formidable contributions to the study of American thought. He was interested especially in young instructors and encouraged them to follow their researches. At international conferences he was always a champion of moderation and enlightenment. At the same university, Edman became an unforgettable event in the life of thousands of students who were grateful to him for the beauty of his style and his attempt to make philosophical problems relevant to our own time.

A. Kaplan at U.C.L.A. impressed many students with his eloquence. Broad in his interests and well acquainted with Oriental culture, he tried to show the relationship between philosophy and other cultural enterprises. In his style of speaking, he almost approached the greatness of Santayana and like the latter he regarded much of man's intellectual quest as a poetic enterprise.

At Scripps College, T. M. Greene, a prolific author, taught with vigor after years at Princeton and Yale. Greene preferred the calmness and relatively slow pace of a small college to the brisk organization of a large university. He impressed the coeds at Scripps with his learning and his ability to dramatize philosophical problems. He demanded high standards of expression, both in oral and written recitations. A foe of superficiality, he believed that it was better to cover a few main points in a system of philosophy rather than to discuss many unrelated facts. At the same time, he promoted the personal development of his

students who always found him to be a warm and understanding friend. He maintained that a philosopher should be like a psychiatrist and look upon a student's problem with an open-minded perspective, instead of regarding him as a wayward sinner.

These are only a few examples of proficient teachers in philosophy. They represent various views of man and the universe. They usually differed in their concepts of education. Their backgrounds were diverse. But they had one trait in common: they did not regard study of philosophy and education as for the few; to them it was an avenue for a wider perspective and a more inclusive conception of life.

EVERY UNIVERSITY has certain professors whose lectures are so stimulating, so challenging, and so exceptional that a student feels that his education is not complete unless he takes their classes. Professors of this type like Phelps at Yale, Wilder at Chicago, and Baxter at Southern California, have become truly unforgettable.

To watch a great teacher is like seeing an unforgettable play. Millions of viewers have seen Frank Baxter on television. He describes himself as the last of the romantics, and when he talks about Shakespeare, his favorite subject, the students feel as if they were back in Elizabethan times. He never stands still and occasionally he will act out, with great skill, certain parts of Shakespeare's plays. He reads the dramas of Shakespeare with fervor and deep emotion.

William James at Harvard became famous for his informal style of lecturing. He would never prepare and constantly improvised. To him every question was precious. Impatient with abstraction, he would demand clarity of expression. He had sympathy for all causes—from psychic investigations to revivalism. Was not man defined by emotion rather than by reason? Was not the universe receptive to our wishes? Was not our heart the source of wisdom?

Woodrow Wilson impressed a generation of students at Princeton with his command of political economy. To him it was the most vital subject. He was in absolute control of the classroom. His ideal was to make real gentlemen and scholars out of his students. When he became President of the United States, he often yearned for the academic days at Princeton.

Judge Medina has written a moving tribute to Christian Gauss, the great Dean at Princeton, who influenced so many students. Gauss, a spe-

cialist in Dante, could recite the *Inferno* by heart. More important, he was a discerning critic who always looked for ways to improve the students' work. A famous author wrote, "Gauss gave us hell and made us love it."

There are no absolute rules for teaching. A teacher like Dewey may have been dry and lifeless to many students, yet those who appreciated his ideas were enthralled. Thus, Irwin Edman tells us that to listen to Dewey was to see philosophy in action, with new ideas being discovered and new relationships being established. Dewey's disciple, Kilpatrick, who taught thousands of students at Teachers College, was as eloquent as a prophet, and when he talked about the new education, his sincerity was apparent even to those who opposed him.

As long as faculties contain gifted lecturers, we must not think of the lecture as being obsolete, a survival of the medieval tradition. A great lecture is as significant as a brilliant symphony. When it touches the hearts and the imagination of students it has a lasting value. A lecture can be as problem-centered as a discussion; it can create a real sense of existential involvement between teacher and student.

Unhappily, too many who lecture are not gifted that way. A deadly sin of a lecturer is to read from a book or use notes in a mechanical way. What the student wants is personal interpretation. General ideas remain vague and distant if they are not individualized. An inspired lecturer gives color to experience; he heightens the sensations of the moment. Students thus experience what Aristotle calls a catharsis, a projection of individuality into a universal realm.

The human element invariably prevails in a discussion group. Every class contains at least one talkative extrovert while some students just sit back quietly. In private conferences, they explain

their silence by saying that they enjoy listening more than anything else. Many students, co-eds especially, are unwilling to express their opinions in class because they are extremely sensitive and feel embarrassed if they do not sound intelligent.

To obtain full group participation in a discussion is not an easy task. It involves tact and diplomacy as well as a penetrating understanding of psychology. The student must feel that his opinions are regarded highly by the instructor and that he can express himself freely. Too often the student holds back his opinions, sometimes because he is afraid he will shock the class, on other occasions because he does not want to offend the teacher or contradict him.

Opinions frequently are not backed up by facts. This trend exists outside of the classroom in an even more alarming manner. Just read many newspapers, listen to the commentators, and hear the speeches of the politicians! Usually, one finds fervent convictions but little analysis, pious belief but no intellectual discrimination.

Progressive schools have championed the tutorial group. This is an important contribution to American education. When the teacher, in personal contact with the student, supervises him closely and guides his assignments, the learning process is undoubtedly accelerated. It is not a new approach. This was really the teaching method of Socrates, Buddha, and Confucius. Today, again, we realize how wise the ancient sages were when they saw to it that the teacher and the student lived together; learning then was not just part of the classroom atmosphere, but included all the activities and all the interests of the student.

Breaking down the barriers does not of itself produce creativity. But creative teachers are those who remove barriers between themselves and their students and as a result release their own and their students' creativeness.

A Better Sign

"The better the teacher, the less he will know what the ultimate consequences of his teaching are in the lives of his students. Glib gratitude at the moment means very little; a better sign that the student has been helped may be that he does not know he has; he thinks he has done it by himself."

MARK VAN DOREN
American Council on Education
College Teaching as a Career
1958. Page 8.

Inservice Development of Instructors



Lieutenant Colonel John R. Sala is professor and head of the department of history at the United States Air Force Academy. He is broadly educated: bachelor's degree in Spanish (Bethany College), master's degree in English (West Virginia), Ph.D. in history (Chicago). He has studied at Union Theological Seminary and has completed all requirements but dissertation for a doctorate in education (Missouri). World War II service included duty in both this country and England. He was executive officer of the academic division of the Army University in England, later deputy chief and chief of the education branch of the Office of Military Government, Berlin. He later was director of the Strategic Air Command Instructor Training School and chief of training for Air Force ROTC on the Air Staff in Washington, D. C. He describes features of faculty improvement on his campus that could well have wider adoption.

By JOHN R. SALA

THE FEASIBILITY and hope for success of an in-service professional development program in higher education are conditioned by the following considerations:

- ▶ What is the level of professional training and experience of the instructional staff?
- ▶ To what extent does the institution emphasize the importance of instruction as over against research, extension work, and the like? Does institutional policy support programs of instructor improvement?
- ▶ To what degree do department heads, deans, and other persons charged with the administration of instruction have actual counseling or supervisory authority over content and method of classroom instruction?

The United States Air Force Academy presents an unusually flexible situation for experimentation in the improvement of instruction in higher education. This is a broad statement which requires explanation.

The Academy is the newest of our large higher institutions. It has just graduated its first class. As a 'come-lately' institution it has been in the

fortunate position of being able to draw on the experience of other institutions of higher education everywhere. It has been free to develop its educational program outside any compelling reference to custom or vested interest. It has enjoyed and profited from the counsel of the finest educational talent in this country. There has been the keenest awareness that the early years are the easiest years to experiment and to initiate; and that the nature and spirit of the enterprise are largely fixed in these early years.

The program of the Academy, of course, has not developed completely outside the long and honored educational tradition of the Military and Naval Academies. Perhaps nowhere has the honor system, for example, been applied more effectively and inspiringly to the educational process than at these Academies. The Air Force Academy, therefore, appropriated and applied the honor system without important change. To have done otherwise would be to cut ourselves off from the best of the tried and proven. At the same time, however, the Academy has been in the enviable position of being able to develop and initiate programs based on clearly defined objectives.

From its inception all members of the academic faculty have been career officers drawn from the active Air Force. There are no civilian instructors. This policy rests on many excellent reasons, chief of which is the professional nature of Academy instruction. Too, the Academy seeks to produce a career-committed officer, and teaching by example carries its own strong impact. All of these officers come to the faculty with at least a master's degree in their teaching subject. A quarter to a third of the teaching staff hold the doctorate. All faculty, with the exception of a limited number of statutory permanent professors, serve a four-year tour.

The instructional staff is drawn from a wide variety of sources. Many highly experienced, mature college and university instructors were brought into the then Army Air Corps in 1942 through the recruiting efforts of the so-called Snyder Board; and some of them have stayed in the active force. Other officers have had four years of collegiate teaching on Air Force ROTC faculties, and have taken extensive graduate work in spare time. The largest source of instructors, however, is through the Air Force Institute of

Technology. This unique institution, after review of personnel recommendations from the Academy, places brilliant, scholarly minded junior officers into the graduate schools of the universities. Upon completion of the degree, they are assigned directly to the Academy faculty. Other faculty members have obtained education and experience through off-duty graduate programs offered by many of the higher institutions.

These varied sources of the staff indicate a need for in-service training to weld the faculty into a well-oriented, functioning team. But why a team? Why not let each instructor go his own way and teach to match his fancy? The answers lie within the objectives and procedures of the Academy itself. All service academies have clear-cut goals aimed at professional training. Those goals at the Air Force Academy are not of the 'nuts and bolts training' type; emphasis is firmly upon broad principles of general education. Within this emphasis, however, instruction is guided and problems posed which are directed toward preparation of the cadet to assume intelligent leadership in his profession. This is a major reason for the firm policy that all instructors shall be career (though not necessarily regular) officers on active duty. It means, too, that the content of instruction takes certain distinguishing directions which differ from instruction in the same subjects in higher institutions with undifferentiated goals. As a result, there is special need for in-service development in the direction of understanding what these special goals are and how best to achieve them in instruction.

This team approach is not aimed at 'togetherness' in instruction. The older era of the academies, when identical material was taught to every class section in the same lesson (if such a condition ever existed, which I doubt) is long since gone. In the Air Force Academy cadets are sectioned several times a year in each course upon demonstrated ability *in that course*. This sectioning would be meaningless unless the depth and breadth of instruction, even the fundamental approach, were different for top sections from that of the lower. This means that instructors must and do have wide latitude within the general professional objectives of the Academy. Within this latitude, however, there must be a solid core of common educational experience for all cadets. One clear objective of in-service development then, is to help the instructor find a constructive combination of freedom and order in the classroom.

Programs of instructor improvement are energetically supported by the 'front office' of the Academy. The most cogent aspect of this support lies in the fact that instruction is considered the primary duty of all of the officer staff under the Dean of Faculty. Promotion recommendations are based almost solely on excellence in the teaching function. The Dean himself is a *primus inter pares* professor and department head. All department heads must teach at least one section, and some teach more. Recently this idea was emphasized in an unforgettable way when the Superintendent himself went into the regular history classroom to teach the lesson on Objectives and Strategy of the Civil War. When a 'college president' underlines the importance of teaching *by teaching*, not just talking about teaching—the faculty's respect for its job and its president increases.

This does not mean that research and writing are discouraged; on the contrary, every tool is put in hand to do such work. There is never any question, however, that the work of the classroom comes first.

Since the classroom is the payoff, every encouragement to professional growth in teaching is provided. Departmental conference rooms are beautifully equipped as departmental libraries. Carrels in the main library are set aside for faculty use. Monthly faculty meetings are closely held to a subject of major educational interest to the staff as a whole. Attendance at professional meetings is encouraged. Orientation of new instructors in a two-week summer training session is routine.

Almost unique in higher education in America is the classroom supervisory function within the academies. In the armed services no instructor is under the illusion that his classroom is his castle. He knows that he may be visited and his instruction evaluated at any time. He must teach as if the Chief of Staff might walk in that classroom door—as indeed he might! In fact, department heads and their course chiefs do a great deal of classroom supervision. Their own classroom duties are lightened to give time for this function and the personal conferences that result.

Staff members are encouraged to take additional graduate work at neighboring institutions, and many do. From time to time outstanding people in their fields are brought in to consult with departmental staffs on special course content and instructional problems.

One final point should be made very clear. In-

Adjustment vs. Intellectual Achievement



Convictions are repeatedly expressed that we should expect more of students, that we underestimate their capacities. Trueblood and Mayer have both said it in recent books (see review in Winter issue, "The Vision of Excellence")

and an associate professor of psychology at the University of Redlands says it in the following article in which he supports his case with the findings of his own discipline. Graduate of two universities (A.B., Denison; Ph.D., Chicago), he has held both military and industrial positions as a psychologist, has been a faculty member at Drake University, has published about thirty research papers, has contributed a score of lectures, papers, and conference discussions, and has held notable scholarships, offices, and other distinctions in psychology and education. He rates Thurstone at Chicago the best teacher he ever had.

By JOSEPH R. ROYCE

MOST OF US are pleased that the country is aroused over educational problems, but the irony of the situation is unfortunately too serious to be amusing. Teachers and professors may well see better days both in terms of pay and instruc-

In-Service Development—continued

service growth programs at the Academy are not confined to improvement of teaching methods. Every department pursues programs aimed at broadening and deepening knowledge of the subject matter. No method, however enlightened or effective, can be substituted for competence in the field. The Department of History, for example, has just completed a weekly series of staff discussions, based on specially prepared papers by staff members, of the philosophy of history of Ranke, Treitschke, and Spengler. This is being followed by series on British, French, and American historians.

The Air Force Academy is not doing anything that has not been tried elsewhere before. It is, however, trying to make the most of a flexible and challenging situation to develop forward-looking programs of in-service development for its entire staff.

tional program, and we should be concerned about the scientific education of our youngsters, but not because of the Soviet's Sputnik. We should be concerned because we care about the personal development of our sons and daughters. The fact that we will respond to the crying need of developing significant education for our youngsters only because we now have real technological competition is a deep and bothersome indictment of the shallow mentality of the contemporary American mind. We finally are about to pursue a proper course of action, but for the wrong reasons! We are about to pay the Ph.D. college professor a decent salary, not because he is a valuable asset to the advancement of knowledge and the promotion of much that is good about man and his civilization, but because it is now obvious that the "egghead" is really pretty practical after all, and we need the intellectual's brains in order to do a better job of fighting the cold war with the Russians. This is an evil reason for taking proper action. I trust we will do some soul searching and will think through our reasons for action.

What are we trying to do when we educate? The dictionary states that to educate is "to develop and cultivate mentally or morally" and "to fit for a calling by systematic instruction." A typical liberal arts college catalog states that its aim "is to educate the heart as well as the head, and to develop the student physically, intellectually, and morally." Some collegiate institutions are trade schools or technical colleges, some are finishing schools, some stress military education, and some claim to be primarily concerned with liberal education. The existence of this variety of educational institutions suggests that we are trying to do many things when we educate, including preparing students for life, preparing them for a career or job, and preparing them for getting along with other people. All of these goals are desirable, and we need all types of institutions in order to meet these goals. I shall confine my remarks primarily to liberal arts education.

WHY ARE MANY OF US so concerned about the state of affairs on the contemporary American campus? What is it that disturbs us? Perhaps we can get a clue to what is disturbing if we contrast the contemporary European student with the contemporary American student. In essence, the former is a student and the latter is not.

A student is one who studies, one who studies because he *must*, because ideas are important, because ideas are vital, lively, so big that the individual cannot contain himself. These ideas must be talked over and explored, at any time of the day or night, at any place, not just from 11 to 12 on Monday, Tuesday, and Thursday under the prodding of a professor.

American colleges rarely have the kind of intellectual atmosphere which I have just described. I have been on seven university campuses either as a student or a professor. Only one of these, the University of Chicago, had a thick intellectual atmosphere. Other American colleges have it, but they are rare. They include such places as Reed, Swarthmore, Antioch, and Harvard.

What have these places got that most of the other liberal arts colleges lack? How did they develop this intellectual atmosphere? Essentially they have a program which reflects intellectual maturity, and further, they have a student body which is highly select. They treat the college student as a full-grown, independent, adult human being. They assume he is a student. If he is not, it is understood that he'll take his lumps and leave. Institutions of this type have seminars, tutorials, and senior projects. Attendance at classes is not required. It is assumed that students will attend classes because they want to, not because they have to. All of these procedures point to a growing sense of independence in the development of the student, and a slow but sure awareness that he is coming to grips with deep and significant ideas. He finds himself probing deeply into certain areas of knowledge because his intellectual hunger has not been satisfied, because ideas that are really understood open up new dimensions of life, because the student has been, in effect, intellectually liberated.

At this point the embryonic scholar is on the threshold of one of the most significant aspects of life: he is ready for creativity in thought. He may write a paper for a seminar, or serve as an apprentice in a laboratory research project, or derive a mathematical equation. Now he has had a taste of what it means to pursue knowledge—not out of a book, not rehashing it for a test, not rote memorization, but out of his own head. He has had a hand in creating knowledge. No matter how small the contribution, it was original in whole or in part. There is no other experience in the sphere of education which can motivate one to learn more than the experience of creating new knowledge.

For now the individual is an active searcher, and his thirst for knowledge can never be quenched for the simple reason that the realm of the unknown is literally limitless, and the desire to know all there is to know about a limited domain of knowledge is the disease of the latent or actual "expert." This seeking attitude of the serious student has deep implications, for the person who is truly perceptive has a vitality of existence which gives meaning to life. There is nothing that pleases a teacher more than to be able to tell a colleague about one of his students who recently "caught on fire." What does this happy teacher mean by this phrase? He means that the student has caught something of the deep meaning which lurks behind the facts, skills, and principles of the subject which he has been teaching, and more importantly, that this meaning has become enough a part of the student that the student is now self-propelled to learn more. In other words, the student is independent. He will learn on his own. He does not need a classroom, a professor, or a college campus, although the mature student will certainly make the most of the formal aspects of college.

THE SECOND POINT which was mentioned earlier concerning the characteristics of outstanding American liberal arts colleges was that such colleges have a relatively select student body. The average high school graduate would not even apply for admission to an institution such as Reed or Swarthmore. After several years of rigid admission requirements and turning out superior student products, the problem of obtaining a high calibre of student is accomplished fairly automatically on the basis of self-selection. It is quite similar to the situation of the football player wanting to play on the Notre Dame team. At a great academic center, students want to come because of the intellectual excitement. With a highly select student body, and an enlightened faculty and administration, the development of an outstanding college of liberal arts can become a reality within a decade.

Why do so many American schools and colleges fail to become outstanding intellectual centers? This is a complex question, but the lack of an adequate philosophical basis for educating is certainly a fundamental reason for this failure. I think the heart of this philosophical confusion resides in the fact that American education is really not directed at "cultivating the mind" but rather is directed toward cultivating "good adjustment." Somehow, over the years, schools at all age levels,

from elementary school through college, have bought the goal of "adjustment," and in the process, they seem to have lost sight of their original goal: to educate the head. I feel particularly impelled to speak to this point because I am trained as a psychologist, and it is my belief that much of the present dilemma in which we find ourselves is due to the bastardization of the scientific findings of psychology. As an experimental psychologist I find it difficult to identify the original scientific principles which are supposed to be the underpinnings of much of the practice which we find in today's schools.

It is considered psychologically dangerous to accelerate students. Again, if students move into a classroom situation where they are chronologically younger than their peers, this is supposed to spell death for their future personality development. The accepted alternative to acceleration is enrichment. The fact that highly trained men such as doctors of medicine, lawyers, and college professors are bald and potbellied by the time they are considered to be professionally educated does not seem to be taken into consideration. The sheer quantity of information which has been accumulated over the centuries is simply too much to be digested within the curriculum of any educational system. The necessity for picking and choosing, the demand that we specialize, has been forced upon contemporary society. In a very real sense, no medical doctor or college professor is adequately "prepared" in his specialty, nor could he be in a lifetime of study. Johns Hopkins University has taken a most encouraging step in the area of medical education by inaugurating a plan which will reduce by one year the time it takes to gain the M.D.

Similarly, the reduction in time that it might take a talented student to complete his primary, secondary, and collegiate education would not do violence to his intellect. In fact, there is already considerable evidence which shows that educational acceleration has no harmful effects either educationally, emotionally, or socially. There is evidence, however, which indicates that many a bright student, geared to the pace of the average child, has acquired habits of work and personality characteristics which can only be described as a criminal waste of human resources.

My final example of misapplication of psychological principles is the problem of individual differences and homogeneous grouping. We are told that homogeneous grouping is harmful be-

cause of the psychological problems it produces in response to students being labeled as "geniuses" or "morons." Apparently the desired goal here is to somehow dupe the low I.Q. child into believing that he is just as intellectually capable as his fellows, and similarly, to convince the bright child that he is really nothing very special. I can assure you that the public schools have been very successful in attaining these goals. We have many college students aspiring for advanced degrees whose intellectual capacities are below the level necessary for graduation, and contrariwise, colleges are full of "students" who have a tremendous intellectual potential, but who aspire merely "to get by." Worse yet, several talent surveys indicate that there are as many college calibre students who are not in college as the number presently attending.

It seems obvious that the misapplications cited above are tied to the cult of "adjustment." It is beginning to become apparent that modern education is a huge success in turning out well-adjusted, conforming, average Americans. These are not just so many glib words. Look around you for the evidence. What has happened to the pioneer individualistic type of American who is willing to say what he thinks without regard to the popularity of his utterances? David Riesman thinks that such inner-directed men have been replaced by other-directed men in this country. The American college student is certainly much more concerned about what his fraternity brothers or sorority sisters think of him or her than he is about ideas. In fact, one of the reasons it is so hard to sell ideas to collegiate youth is because a "brain" on campus is regarded as eccentric, "square," or otherwise peculiar; and to be labeled as "different" is clearly intolerable. Individuality, the hard core of American democracy, is clearly in danger! Our inability to tolerate individuality is also related to similar confusions on the contemporary political and social scene. This fact is evident in such matters as anti-intellectualism, witch-hunting, and over-organization of leisure time.

WHAT SHOULD WE DO about all this? We should think through our position. We should discuss and debate the fundamental issues, and try to come to a reasonable philosophy as a basis for educating. In my opinion, the colleges of the country are going to have to take the initiative, thereby forcing the issue from the top down, rather than wait for reform to occur from the bottom up. If the liberal arts college will strike a

blow for intellectual rigor, the impact is bound to be felt throughout the educational hierarchy. It is true that our institutions of higher learning have been victims of economic pressure during the past quarter-century, and that this fact may have cowed them into submission. And it is true that they will continue to be under economic pressure unless the American public gives education the financial support it needs in order to do a proper job. If the Soviet Sputnik does provoke us to action, each of us has a right, nay the responsibility, to raise the following question: Will these institutions be ready to liberally educate, or will they still be caught up in the philosophical cult of "adjustment"?

The basic symbols of modern civilization are words and numbers. Modern man cannot make his way through the maze of contemporary life without reasonable skill in dealing with such symbols. And yet the college graduate of the present decade can do little more than basic arithmetic, light reading, and barely adequate writing. The liberal arts college of the next decade should demand that the entering college student possess at least basic skills in dealing with words and numbers! So-called classes in "bonehead" English should be eliminated from the college catalog along with the "boneheads." College freshmen should have enough knowledge of the nature of mathematics so that they can at least appreciate the place of quantitative thinking in a scientific age. The reason college freshmen are so deficient in the basic number and word skills is simple. The colleges will admit them without proficiency in such skills. Let me illustrate what I mean. I teach a junior level course in statistical methods, in which the mathematics gets no more complicated than simple algebra. And yet most of the students think of this as a "tough" course. They cannot be expected to know how to do square root (or to relearn it outside class time), and they are floored when the formulas and the concepts begin to get a little abstract. I frequently assign term papers and essay examinations in my courses. Last year a *senior* turned in an essay examination which was completely unbelievable. He had capital letters in the middle of sentences, punctuation signs placed at random, and words just strung together. In other words, he wasn't communicating anything. Incidentally, his handwriting was so poor that he was unable to read his own answers to me! This was an extreme case to be sure; but this student graduated. Furthermore, he graduated from one

of the better liberal arts colleges in the country. The distressing point here is that this one case is indicative of the low level of proficiency in word symbols, and this type of deficiency can be documented profusely by any college English department in the country.

What am I arguing for? Professor Mandell Bober of Lawrence College sums it up rather neatly as follows: "When you leave this room I want you to feel that you have learned something. Don't go out and just develop your personality." Does this position mean that we are not interested in the personal development of our students? No, but it does call for a review of the function of the school in our society. Is it not ridiculous to ask the public school teachers of 30 or 40 students per class to take on the tasks of serving as parental alter ego and psychological counselor on top of a teaching schedule that would inundate less dedicated servants of the public? Is it not unjust, unwise, and unnecessary for them to be asked to take over the functions of the many family units and religious institutions of this country? In their eager and kind efforts to educate "the whole child" modern professional educators somewhere got off the path which our society originally carved out for our educational institutions—namely, to nurture intellectual capacities. While it is obviously necessary to consider the whole person in order to do an effective job of teaching, I do not believe it follows that the school should literally move the remainder of society into the schoolroom in order to do so. If the modern day trend toward centralization of function continues apace we will soon have only two major institutions in this country, the federal government and the school. Krushchev's prediction that the next generation of Americans will be living under a completely socialistic system of government may not be as far off as we think.

The kind of transformation of the activities of the modern school that I am talking about would *not* mean a return to the three R's. There is too much evidence available to show that the many instructional and motivational innovations of today's schools are extremely effective in maximizing the ability of children to learn. The unimaginative, monotonous, repetitious drill of the little red school house is not the answer to our educational problems. Nor is the answer to our Soviet threat to be found in the procedure of making engineers out of everybody. But let's not try to solve all the problems at once.

Some Notes on Teaching Education Courses



A professor of education who (with a distinguished colleague) has published, in addition to other writings, an excellent book on college teaching presents his suggestions on teaching his own subject. He says he wrote this article lovingly and in hope that other

men in other disciplines would similarly share their thinking and experience of teaching. The author (A.B., City College of N. Y.; M.A., Ph.D., Columbia) has been on the faculty of Brooklyn College since 1934. He had four years of World War II service, winning the Legion of Merit for service in the Africa-Middle East theater. He received the first Fellowship in International Education awarded by Kappa Delta Pi and spent a year in Italy, after which his little book "The Italian People and Their Schools" was published. He is a member of the Editorial Advisory Board and a strong friend of this journal.

By JOSEPH JUSTMAN

EDUCATION, the oldest and most essential of applied arts, has lately become also a university discipline. A composite subject deriving ingredients from more basic disciplines of man, nature, and society, Education the discipline has not yet settled in form or crystallized in substance. There has not been time to fix borders, mark out paths of progression, distil and compress learnings. The study of Education catches the student in academic midstream when he is moving fast and it is at its sluggish start. From these and other conditions arise problems of teaching which sometimes leave the student at odds with his subject and with learning impaired.

I have been following these problems for twenty-five years during which I have taught representative Education courses to students ranging from college sophomores to those pursuing graduate work. Pride and a reasonably sincere belief in educational principles which I propagate have made me sensitive to the effects of this instruction, and eager to satisfy my students without pampering them. I have treated each course

as a separate hurdle: some I have overcome very well, others I have not yet succeeded in mastering. I learned by my own experience, trial and error, the help of colleagues, and of students. I wish I could say that consulting the professional literature was beneficial too, but apart from general doctrine spread in all the books, I found little specifically useful.

I offer these Notes in the hope of stimulating an exchange among teachers of Education who have found similar (or other) problems and furnished their own solutions. From this exchange may also come something of value to new teachers who, in the years ahead, will carry a greater burden of proving their competence than we did. The suggestions which follow derive from reflections of my experience not assessed against the judgment of others, and unavoidably contain some generalizations which are open to dispute. I have tried not to be too sententious, but may not have fully succeeded. If the tone at times sounds imperative, remember that I am addressing first of all myself.

1. *Decide how you can maintain the accent on Education, not on related subject matter derived from other disciplines.* A college subject needs to have an integrity of its own, and cannot exist mainly as borrower or interpreter of the substance of other disciplines. The extent and type of emphasis will vary, but every Education course (except those clearly designated otherwise) should focus on matters of education, employing related subject matter in a supporting, though important, role. A derivative subject, Education cannot be taught without intimate connections of knowledge drawn from other studies, but this knowledge should not be allowed to displace or disperse that which is inherent to the study of education itself. There should be no occasion for the student to remark: "Much of this is repetition of learning I have encountered elsewhere. Now when do we get to (the subject of) Education?"

Every Education course in the limited offerings of an undergraduate college has a body of doctrine related to educational theory or practice in its broad or narrow application. History of Education is not a course in history but in a special history centering on the development of educational ideas, practices, and institutions and drawing upon surrounding intellectual and social

backgrounds in a contributory way. One can give the course its legitimate emphasis without fear of bogging down in details of technical pedagogy. Courses in educational psychology and philosophy build upon, extend, and apply to education psychological and philosophical subject matter without the necessity of plagiarizing. Newer, less conventional Education courses, particularly those relating education to society, present somewhat greater difficulty in proper accentuation, but even these can be managed so that the intensive climax of learning is on analysis and interpretation of educational ideas and processes rather than, as frequently happens, on social science content.

Without doubt Education teachers have taken liberties in raiding fields beyond their scholarly competence, to their disadvantage. This is a recent development, very little in evidence in courses and books of former years. A glance at some current course materials and textbooks (which both reflect and influence instruction) will suffice to show the extent to which they trade on borrowed subject matter, superficially treated. There is no reason *per se* why Education teachers should not be specially proficient in one or more allied disciplines, and many of them are; but sooner or later the Education teacher who heads fearlessly into instructing intermediate or upperclass students in tax finance, business cycles, corporation practices, or population theory, will come a cropper. I have seen it happen. Our colleagues in other fields have taken heed too; hence the outcry that courses in educational history, philosophy, and psychology should be taught by the appropriate liberal arts teachers. This remedy would be as bad as the ailment. It ignores the fact that an Education course, if it should be taught at all, contains a distinctive body of scholarship which is important for the student to master and for the teacher to know how to teach. Shifting to another category of teacher will not ensure the fulfillment of these requirements, will indeed lessen its chances.

What of the host of "background" or purely liberal arts courses which crowds the pages of teachers college catalogs? Teachers colleges have their own troubles in trying to bring up to the mark teachers or prospective teachers lacking in fundamental elements of general education. I am not here defending nor criticizing the presence of such courses; but where they are needed and retained, they should be classed if at all possible under the disciplines to which they belong, however they may be staffed. Passing them as Educa-

tion courses serves further to disarray an already untidy field.

2. *Purge your course material of anything that is thin, commonplace, or self-evident, leaving a core of knowledge and skills that calls for some effort in mastering.* The charge has been made (and not without basis) that Education courses are lacking in rigor and abound with the commonplace. To an extent the same charge holds for any subject whose content is non-esoteric, without a built-in ladder of prerequisite skills and a clearly graduated progression of difficulty. Education is younger than most subjects, and there yet remains to cleave the solid substance from the connective tissue and wastage. Perhaps also we Education teachers are inclined, by training and earlier experience, to spell out things that should be taken for granted.

If a good teacher does not attempt, carpetwise, merely "to cover," then the basic Education courses (I am not speaking of tenuous offshoots) offer more than adequate opportunity for intellectual adventure, with peaks of thought to scale, interesting recesses to explore, and important skills to master. The problem in some courses is to identify these learnings, clothe them in proper but nonsuperfluous context, and skip lightly over the rest. Anyone who does not produce in educational history or philosophy enough intellectual matter to challenge the most demanding student is, I am afraid, a poor teacher. Educational psychology is a near science which can be raised to almost any level. Apart from embodying essential and quite rigorous techniques in measurement and statistical usage, it opens the door to experimentation and research designed to disclose the most important and fascinating of all secrets—how people grow, develop, learn, become as they are—most of which are not yet known. The course makes possible a broad latitude of treatment to accommodate to any student's ability or previous preparation.

Again, recent courses of less standard design are apt to be more troublesome, a difficulty which does not necessarily impeach their inherent promise. Various courses in Introduction to Education, School and Society, The Child in the Community, The Child and the Curriculum, have not had a shake-down, and are consequently of more mixed quality and looser formation. With a little care, however, the teacher can separate the mixture, sparing himself the dogged pursuit of the commonplace alongside that which is rare and worth-

while. Converting generalized talk into concrete tasks of learning helps. There is nothing like first hand field or case study to push familiar knowledge into the background and highlight the new and yet unknown. Students hustle to find rewarding sources of information instead of yawning over a textbook. One sacrifices coverage and perhaps clearer continuity. What of it?

Try stiffening the backbone of some of your courses by rearranging the content into a series of specific and concrete investigations: how does a particular school board actually operate; who are the people or groups of special educational influence in a given community; who are the juvenile delinquents, where do they come from, what do they do, and what is being done for them; in what ways has one school sought to improve itself in the last five years; what does Johnny learn and fail to learn in *his* school; what does Johnny's mother think he learns and fails to learn? As students begin to observe, secure and check facts, analyze, evaluate, and strictly report their findings, the irritatingly simple loses its simplicity, and respect develops even for mundane generalizations.

3. *Be choosy about books and study materials.* Students take their cue to the worth of a course from the quality of study materials which accompany it. Such materials may handicap instruction or greatly extend its effectiveness. We Education teachers operate under a handicap in this respect.

Without joining the chorus of Education baiters, one may concede that our literature is more distinguished for abundance than for quality. A lucrative market has multiplied publishers' offerings, and changing fads in teaching have hastened the obsolescence of good books. There is great turnover, and each year we are offered more publications than one can read. Not all can possibly be good, and many on inspection turn out not to be. The best books are apt to be technical, specialized, or those conforming to firmly established courses. The poorest are general, elementary, or are tailored to accommodate a variety of contingent offerings in a broad field: they tend to wander beyond the author's sphere of special competence, are summary and conclusional without being documented, and talk down to the student. Recently some textbook writers have taken to arranging their material in clipped, manicured "units of study" offensive to students' intelligence. The writing is speckled with pedageese.

For some courses I have no difficulty finding

suitable texts and reading materials; in others the textbook presents a problem. In such case, with the concurrence of students, I sometimes use an expedient which is workable even if not entirely satisfactory: I supply the function of a text, issuing content outlines, reading lists, and study exercises, furnishing the course continuity, and filling in lacunae of factual information; the students undertake to do solid reading in collateral books and materials of good quality which are more plentiful. The weakness of the practice is the students' dependence on the teacher as a source of factual knowledge on which to thread the course. On the other hand, I have the satisfaction of knowing that their reading commits them more firmly to the study of Education.

My reading lists are short and selective, never inclusive. For part of a course, for example, which undertakes in a few weeks to survey educational developments in the United States since 1890, the reading list contains Charles Pierce's *Values in a Universe of Chance*, Stanley Hall's *Adolescence*, William James' *Pragmatism*, Dewey's *Reconstruction in Philosophy*, *Sources of a Science of Education*, and *Experience and Education*, Alfred Whitehead's *Aims of Education*, and very few other titles. (It is almost a venture in name dropping.) I furnish statistics of population change, economic development, urban growth, school attendance, organization, program offerings, and the like, usually taken straight from Census, Office of Education, or other government reports. We compromise—partly lecture, partly source reading—on major developments in psychology, the rising science of education, and the reports of important educational commissions. In utilization of class time we try to strike a balance between factual presentation and analysis of ideas.

This device is far from novel, and other teachers use it or other devices with as much or greater success. Our aim is to guide students toward fertile literature and away from the arid. There is much that is first rate in scholarly studies, research articles or monographs, special reports and yearbooks, and works of classic reputation. The recent trend toward reissuing important writings as paperbacks has made good books more cheaply accessible to students. Working such materials into a course is more of a task than merely naming a textbook and may even require some alteration of course design but, provided they are relevant to what the teacher wants to teach, is worth the added effort. Such materials inject an element

of elevating intellectual quality into teaching and learning. The usual precaution needs to be observed against duplicating titles or reading lists of other courses, in and out of Education.

4. *Raise your estimate of the student's capacity and will to work.* I have never heard an able student praise a cheap course or criticize a good course because it was demanding. Even run-of-the-mill students who choose cheap courses in order to "get by" regard them with disdain. Our Education offerings are neither cheap nor exceptionally demanding, but it seems to me that we Education teachers tend to underestimate the student's capacity and willingness to "put out." If you doubt this observation, on the next occasion compare the assignment you have just given a student with some of those he brings from non-Education courses.

The tendency may reflect our virtues as teachers more than our faults. We believe in teaching the student as well as the subject, are mindful of him as a person, and considerate of him as a learner. By comparison, the liberal arts teacher is more wrapped up in his subject, and less inclined to make allowances for the student. He is apt to demand the full measure of output due in the course while we Education teachers ration our requirements more in accordance with what we term reasonable.

Yet, after many years of contrary belief, I have recently become persuaded that in his assessment of the student's capacity the liberal arts teacher is closer to the truth than I have been. I have lately been stepping up the work to the point where, for example, in some courses students read at the rate of one book or substantial piece of writing every two or three weeks and submit a written critique, along with smaller, specific day-to-day assignments. Students have taken the increased load in stride, and there is no murmur so long as I keep reading and returning the papers—that is, provided I work as hard as they do. I toughened up an advanced course in research technique only to hear the students remark at the end, with a certain smug satisfaction, that "it wasn't as hard as expected." It will be harder next year. Students seem to like to pit their capacity against the demands of a course, and actually to enjoy doing more, provided the total task is not backbreaking. At that, their elasticity is astonishing.

There is no sense in being brutal, and Education is not a subject which should compete with

some really heavy-weight offerings in the college program. There is no foreign language to learn (that is, if you exclude the jargon), there are few natural barriers to understanding and a relatively small number of exacting skills, these being mostly in the scientific substance of Education. The culmination of Education study is teaching, which is a difficult art cultivated by experience. Yet, in order to appease the student's appetite for work and to hold his own in the strenuous competition of the college course of study, the Education teacher might try experimentally to increase both the level and volume of accomplishment until a satisfactory point has been reached. Especially should this be done for the abler students who tend to wander hungrily through our courses.

5. *Get directly to work without spending much time on "orientation" or in discussing "how-to-do-it."* New teachers will take heed, I hope, while seasoned ones bear with me in the elaboration of this truism. The urge to "orient" is to my mind one of the afflictions of Education teaching: we offer needless, insipid "orientation" courses; take pains to inscribe course descriptions in college catalogs, then proceed to explain the courses in detail to the class; and engage in long-winded "cooperative" planning of things that are not arduous at all. We prepare students for a learning experience, and afterward wring them dry of what they have learned. My objection to these practices is not primarily that they are wasteful of course time but that they substitute procedural activity for substantive scholarship, take the edge off interesting learning tasks, and tend to make instruction childishly explicit, leaving little to the student's imagination and private mind. A college course, to me, is one in which the teacher and students often communicate by implicit discourse.

Long ago I learned not to offer lengthy prolegomena to courses. Instruction begins in the first hour, after the first few minutes: a word of personal introduction, a quick roll call, a brief identification of the course, then we are off: there will be plenty of time to get to know students, fix course standards, and build prestige. First in the order of study is invariably a meaty, fact-laden topic which I have extracted for the purpose. Instruction is by informal lecture, and the pace is fast: I want to be sure that notetaking students will have something to read when they get home. This continues for several class meetings after which we gradually settle into a more normal pace, utilizing varied techniques with various

kinds of subject matter and finding time, too, for the amenities of classroom living. I tend to forego, however, extended planning sessions. Again toward the end of the term the subject matter is intensified and the pace quickened, so that the course will finish strong. Students are not displeased with these tactics; quite the contrary. I haven't found any positive relationship between a folksy, tender approach and good student morale throughout the term.

All of which does not signify that it is unimportant for a teacher to be an easy, approachable person, reasonable and fair in relations with students, watchful of their interests, and bearing his scholarship lightly. A course which is "all business" can be very dull. Rather, it is an injunction against diluting further a discipline which in places is already dilute, and giving sustenance to those who enjoy inspiring students with a mindset against Education. If, in order to do our job successfully, we need to be artful, let us be artful.

6. *Use strong examinations fairly frequently in ways that they were intended.* Our part of the profession has contributed more than its share toward improving the examination as an instrument for measuring learning. Having done this, we turn about and develop a reluctance to use it as such. We test sparingly, follow examination periods with long clinical postmortems. Some colleagues, acting on what they believe is principle, have been known to give away questions in advance, as if to spare students a sordid experience. The subject of Education needs tests as much as any other, not only to bring home to students the existence of a body of scholarship to be mastered but also to train them in recalling and using knowledge in the confrontation of vital school problems. Education teachers are easily as prepared to write good examinations as are teachers in other fields.

Students do not object to examinations provided they are fair and yield some return for effort expended, either in success achieved or in the learning experience itself. They do not especially favor easy ones, and hate those which are erratic. What they seem to want is an opportunity to put to use what they have learned, pit their skill against the challenge of new situations, assemble known facts in new patterns. An element of novelty seems to be a necessary attribute of a good examination.

I use examinations with reasonable frequency, more often the essay than the objective forms

which take longer to prepare and are not as remunerative. Occasionally I mix in an extended test exercise which students can do at home. One or two questions suffice for an hour's examination, to give students time to reflect, organize their answers, and write carefully. They learn to expect an examination which is vigorous but not unreasonable, pertinent to the class work but not repetitious. The papers are returned with a brief annotation conveying the critical reaction of an interested reader to a thoughtful writer. They are also graded, but by tacit agreement no one talks much about grades. So far as I know, no student has yet been traumatized by this experience.

I do not succeed in writing a good examination every time, though not for want of trying. But this does not prevent me from continuing to give examinations without apology. The perfect examination is still to be written, and students understand this. We do our subject less than justice if, knowing the limitations of examinations, we withhold from our students, or timidly or rarely extend, the healthy uses which they also possess. Students like to try out their strength, and there is enough rigor in Education to provide an even contest. A few vigorous examinations will add starch to your course.

7. *Keep students away from the use of jargon.* No discipline, I suppose, is free of a fungus of jargon, and ours has had a lovely growth. The best way to get rid of it is by regular sprays of laughter rather than by solemn sermonizing. But one does grow weary of the awkward ritualistic phrases, of seeing sensible ideas abused by the clodhopping way in which they are expressed, especially as our friends, the violent anti-Educationists, make themselves understood in lean, muscular prose. We are all guilty to a degree, not only the faddists who strain to prove the originality of their thought by the eccentricity of their language. Yet our profession is not a cult or mystery, but a practical calling whose mission is to make common things plainer to common people. Lucidity is our prime need, and we should be setting a good example to others, not leave ourselves open to ridicule.

A good way to keep students from adopting the jargon is to maintain firm control of one's own language and to direct them to works written in reputable English. Having consciously placed a curb on myself, I don't have much difficulty enforcing a similar restraint on students. Shortly after we have made our acquaintance, anyone

guilty of a lapse into forbidden dialect (myself included) pays a nominal fine, unless he quickly retracts. So far there has been no need to account for funds because little has been collected. Students accept the prohibition in good humor, pull my leg a bit, but cooperate. There is freshness in class discussion as students dig into their own idiom, not always impeccable, to explain their own ideas; a better quality of thinking, too. Written work takes on the flavor of distinctive authorship. The ban on jargon is our private Declaration of Independence, as is our refusal to become absorbed into one or another "school of thought."

We have some difficulty with educational literature and are forced to compromise. Working one's way through some of the murky pages of John Dewey is usually worth while, though the same cannot always be said of his lesser disciples. We ignore some, feel compelled to read others, and await a better day.

8. *Take criticism in stride.* The reinvigorated chorus of criticism of Education is at least as much a symptom of general confusion as it is a reflection of our weaknesses. Some of the criticism is valid, some exaggerated, and some the dreariest nonsense. Our critics' constructive proposals likewise are a mixture of the good, the questionable but possibly good, and that which long ago should have been decently interred. What gives the criticism great currency is the doubt in the public's mind regarding the causes of unsettling world events, including the role played by the school. The chances are that the criticism will persist for a while, and we had better learn to live with it without becoming discountenanced. The worst we can do is to lose faith in our discipline and what it stands for, in the way of preparing teachers and fashioning

schools.

A serious consequence of this criticism has been in its effect on some students. No longer contained within professional bounds, it has become common gossip wherever teachers or students gather. Not all students allow themselves to become infected, but enough to create a problem in teaching. What bothers me is not the skeptic or the iconoclast, but the student who has written off in advance what I'm going to teach him. A very few such students appear in every class, brought there by certification requirements, and unless I am mistaken, their number, though tiny, is growing. They are not among the ablest students, but potentially good enough. They betray their attitude by belittling the American school and its works, scoff at "mediocrity" and "mass education," complain of "anti-intellectualism," and are irritated by concern for "average" children. This attitude persists through instruction. I, in turn, keep wondering what sort of teacher I am helping to release into the schools.

Sensitive to this critical climate the Education teacher must resist becoming submissive or, contrarily, being tricked into a vigorous defense of his subject before students. The latter are entitled to even-tempered instruction even where a storm swirls roundabout. I try to comport myself in this way, avoiding head-on collision, never arguing the case of Education but letting the subject do its own talking. My faith in the idealism, intellectual honesty, and good sense of students remains unimpaired, as well as in the willingness of the great majority to learn. What is really satisfying is to observe an exceptionally able student as he enters a course with skeptical detachment and leaves with a positive commitment to Education.

Education of Emotions

"Actually, there have never been enough emotionally mature people in the world, not even in high places. If there had been, we would have avoided wars and strikes far better than has ever been the case. The destruction of the library at Louvain twice within a quarter century is illustrative of what happens because educators, among others, concentrate on scholasticism without including also adequate attention to the education of emotions."

F. ALEXANDER MAGOUN

First Day and Last Day



A professor with a class of thirty is trustee of a half hour of human time (in addition to his own) for every minute of a class session. Mindful of this, how can he dismiss early the first or last day? Thought in this vein is presented by a member of the English faculty (A.B., Quincy College; M.A., Ph.D., Illinois) at the University of Alabama. The author has contributed many articles to journals including this journal.

By ROBERT L. COARD

COMPLAINT of the professor: "I simply don't have enough time to cover what I want to in a semester." Such a remark often makes me smile. Frequently it is uttered by the very college teachers who dismiss their classes thirty or forty minutes early, on both the opening and closing days of the semester. At the beginning, "Students don't have their books," and at the end, "What can you do with them on the last day?" To be sure, teaching is too delicate an art to be subjected to the efficiency engineer, but such a widespread lackadaisical attitude toward the important beginning and ending of instruction is shocking. What would the businessman and industrialist, whose ears are now ringing with professorial laments about the small rewards of teaching, say if they were acquainted with this prodigious waste of time?

Dismissing opening classes after ten or fifteen minutes has a particularly unfortunate effect on that lost soul, the entering freshman. Confused and bewildered, plagued by the highest dropout rate in the school, the incoming freshman is likely to receive his first enduring impression of the college class in the form of an audible sigh of relief uttered by his instructor as that gentleman turns the class loose thirty minutes early. Possibly abbreviating opening class in this fashion may spare the teacher a few repetitions of announcements, but one wonders whether overcoming a bad initial impression won't finally require a good deal more unpleasant labor, especially about the time of mid-semester reports.

What can one do on the first day of class that won't degenerate into mere busy work? Part of the period may be devoted to calling the roll, list-

ing any prerequisites for the course, and writing out the names of the text and of the teacher. All of this seems obvious enough; but judging from the abundance of mimeographed notices on the subject that I've received from heads of departments and deans in the colleges in which I've taught, even the obvious isn't too well observed. Students who wish to drop or transfer in multi-sectioned classes often can't identify their current instructors because the latter have never supplied their names. Sometimes this omission of a name brings its own punishment when students attempt to identify their instructors with verbal descriptions! I shudder slightly as I recall a description of myself given under these circumstances: "He wears glasses and laughs at his own jokes."

A resounding summary of the advantages to be gained from a study of the particular subject might well follow the more mechanical classroom matters on opening day. Too often teachers assume that students know or ought to know the value of the subject in which they are enrolled. I recall reading the preface of a history textbook in which the brief observation was made that every educated man knows the value of a study of modern history. Well, every educated man may, but the average college class is made up largely of young people whose education is decidedly imperfect.

Certain points must be spelled out for a beginner, though not, of course, in an obtrusive or condescending manner nor at too great length. I remember being called rather sternly to task by a student to whom I had enumerated somewhat proximately the reasons for studying humanities. In turn he suggested that they might be adequately summarized under the single word "required." Probably most of us would agree that the one word statement is too brief!

Furnishing information about the outlook and limitations of the textbook and supplying some pertinent facts about its authors might occupy part of opening day. Related matters involving the parts of a book, the steps in the manufacture of a book, and details concerning copyright provide other possible starting points, especially in literature classes. In a class in literature made up largely of students in commerce I find a discussion of the history of the copyright laws and their

effect on American literature will be followed with interest. Nor is this talk mere filler material, for information about the financial and legal aspects of literary production will enable the listener to view the subject in a more realistic light. After all, the correspondence of even the lyric poets contains about as many references to money as to love.

Instead of lecturing, the teacher might spend part of the first period asking the students about their previous acquaintance with the subject. Often students will claim they never had any instruction in that subject, or if they did they can't remember it—information that is sometimes accurate enough—but generally after some pump priming they will furnish helpful data. If the teacher receives little factual information from this quizzing about the student's background in the subject, he is not wasting his time, for he is becoming acquainted with the student himself.

If the class enrollment is not likely to fluctuate greatly, perhaps the best opening day activity of all is to begin serving the main course—to make a definite assignment for the next meeting and to provide detailed instructions on how to carry it out.

About as much time is likely to be lost at the end of a semester as in the beginning. Some classes ostensibly finish their work a day ahead of time (I always wonder about them) and are dismissed. As a consequence the students in other classes become restless, and the teachers, by now too weary to fight the current any longer, decide to end the semester a little early. Or perhaps the last class day is really only half a day, and is it worthwhile to come just for that?

It seems to me that the last class period, after the necessary instructions about review and several repetitions about the time and place of final examinations, might well be devoted to "consumer research." On the last day I like to ask students what class activity of the semester they found the most profitable and what class activity they found the least profitable. Sometimes the colorless wording of the question doesn't ward off a few stinging personal reflections about the administra-

tion of the class, but these adverse criticisms often prove to be the most valuable. I try to listen in humility, though there is some straining at the leash.

On the other hand, students who have been buttering up to teacher all semester now have to wrestle with the question of what was the least profitable activity. I must confess I occasionally enjoy badgering these students into answering the awkward question in spite of their deep reluctance.

On the last day the teacher and students might also derive benefits from student criticism of the textbook and outside reading assignments. In examining the anthology employed by a literature class, I like to conduct a love-hate poll on the final day to learn what selection annoyed the class the most and which gave it the greatest pleasure. Similarly I like to ask the class which books to retain for outside reading and which to drop. Of course, students shy away from difficult books and authors, but within limits their opinions are sound enough and, sound or unsound, they usually have pedagogical value. The last day also gives the teacher a chance to gather student opinion on the probable worth of his projected and rejected assignments.

On the last day of class one might inquire what plans the students have for further study of the subject. This rash assumption, it is hoped, is one that all teachers will be brazen enough to make. If, as alas too often happens in an elementary course, one hasn't even got around to mentioning the principal magazines of general interest in the field, now is the last opportunity to do so. In literature at least one might conclude with a discussion of reading lists or paperback books or book clubs or the pleasures of a private library. In music one might consider the best record buys and the most suitable phonographs; in art, the chief museums of the United States; in science, the most recent developments.

No matter what a teacher's subject is, it presents a wealth of material requiring the use of the full hour both the first day and the last.

Most Productive Possession

"While people try to foster trees for the sake of their fruit, the greater portion of mankind are heedless and neglectful of that most productive possession which is called a friend."

SOCRATES

Perspective by Participation



When Wheaton College had a fall retreat for its faculty, an anthropology professor contributed to a symposium, "Focus on Better Teaching." The following article is taken from it. He tells us how (in a course that has since grown into two sections of fifty students each) a larger degree of student participation leads to increased learning. He is a graduate of Wheaton (Illinois), of Pennsylvania (M.A.), and a doctoral candidate at Columbia University where he is studying under a Danforth Foundation Teachers' Study Grant.

By JAMES O. BUSWELL III

CANTOR POINTS OUT that "The student cannot assimilate knowledge-symbols unless he is able to locate in his own experience the reality to which the symbol refers."¹ This is identification. Knowledge leads to learning when it becomes integrated with one's own concerns; when it can be made to involve the person and his life to such an extent that he will release his tight emotional grip upon the attitudes formerly or perhaps even yet held dear, and pursue more knowledge, now motivated by a new concern for understanding in terms of one's whole system of values with which the knowledge is now dynamically identified. This is the beginning of participation.

The fruits of such learning are the rewards of good teaching.

One day, over coffee in the Student Union, a colleague of mine indicated a group of students in one of the booths concerned together over some reading matter. "Wouldn't it be something," he observed, "if they got that excited over something in the latest issue of *Foreign Affairs* or the *American Anthropologist*?" But what would a peek over the shoulders reveal? *Life* magazine, most likely, or *Sports Illustrated*, or perhaps even the latest profundity from Pogo.

The intellectual atmosphere on our campus should foster individual and group interest and concern for the contents of professional journals. This would be participation. And it can be fostered by teaching methods which involve literal or more conscious participation, as well as those

which have chiefly intellectual participation as a goal. This is a distinct necessity in the effort to overcome the current failure to change basic attitudes and values during the college career. For, as Cantor, as well as others, has pointed out, "knowledge gained through direct participation in translating ideas into personal significance modifies one's system of attitudes."²

I would like to illustrate this by reporting a method of teaching which is intended to bring about possibly a greater degree of student participation in his learning process, and increased identification with what is learned, in a course which lends itself perhaps better than some to this type of teaching.

In the general ethnology class for the past five years we have been conducting a role playing technique of instruction³ in order to increase the students' facility for looking through the eyes of another culture. In the first week of the semester the class is divided into three "tribes." Each member is expected to become as familiar with the culture of his assigned tribe as the literature allows. A little later on each student is assigned a particular role in his tribe. One will be a fisherman's wife, one a chief executioner in a king's court, one a medicine man, or a chief, or a child, or a grandmother. Each student is required now to become intimately familiar not only with the culture itself, but with his own particular relationship to the society.

This preparation in the literature on the tribe, and familiarization with tribal roles is carried on in addition to the regular assignments and course of instruction for the first twelve weeks. The first six weeks is spent chiefly in geographical and world cultural orientation. The second six weeks is devoted to the study of about a dozen different societies in as much detail as possible, as well as the study of field research methods.

In the final six weeks of the semester, the role playing is conducted in the following manner: Tribe number 1 assembles before the class in whatever situation the members may devise. Sometimes an episode of about five minutes will be acted out; sometimes the members will simply be occupied with different tasks or in quiet conversation. Tribe number 2, not in tribal role at this time, approaches the role playing tribe as ethnographers. It is the responsibility of the eth-

nographers to make initial contact, subsequent inquiry, and continued interview for three consecutive class periods. Initially only one or two ethnographers approach, while the others listen and observe. Later on they may break up and interviewing may continue in small groups.

At the end of a week the ethnographers write up their description of the culture which they have been examining, and present it at the next meeting of the class. At this time the tribe under observation has the opportunity of correcting mistaken impressions, explaining points which were misinterpreted or overlooked. Then group number 3, which has been observing all week, presents a critique, first of the ethnographers, and then of the role players.

Subsequently the turns at role playing are rotated until each tribe has acted as players, ethnographers, and critics.

The values of this classroom method can be many and far reaching. Each student, when his tribe is being investigated, must act totally in terms of the culture of that tribe. This includes not only the manners, the etiquette, and superficial customs, but the value system as well. In addition, each tribal group is set up to involve kinship relationships between members which are invariably *vastly* different from the relationships of our own kinship system. These not only demand an understanding of intricate and reciprocally consistent relationships with each member of the group, but reciprocally consistent behavior patterns between each relative, prescribed by their particular relationship. Thus, not only are the responses to the presence and questions of the ethnographer to be in terms of the culture, but all interaction with other members of the tribe must be consistent at all times.

It can readily be seen that each student is forced to objectify his own culture to such a degree that he can identify himself with the new culture. This enforced empathy allows the student to grasp the foreign culture's own self-consistency, its own system of logic, its own interrelated behavior patterns based upon its own system of values.

Similarly, the ethnographic role forces the inquirer to probe, not in terms of his own cultural perspective, but to seek identification with that of his informant.

What does all this accomplish for the student in the long run? Obviously he learns to understand that people are different and that their dif-

ferences do not necessarily make them bad, nor inferior, nor to be evaluated in any sense by our own culture.

The student learns, as well, some of the important problems of cross-cultural communication. Since everything is conducted in English, the purely nonlinguistic barriers to effective communication are highlighted, and a profoundly new aspect of the problems of foreign contacts is brought inevitably into focus.

This matter of communication, and the enforced position of being identified with a foreign viewpoint, carries with it important implications for study in other areas, chiefly in philosophy and the social sciences. The very fact of having to reintegrate oneself in terms of another set of behavior patterns and responses takes one out of one's own limited frame of reference and permits a reexamination of aspects of it which were previously taken completely for granted. The student recognizes his emotional attachments to certain attitudes and values. Once recognized, these attitudes and values are either reinforced with logic and reason, or else they are modified in terms of new, meaningful knowledge with which the student has now been able to identify himself.

In commenting on this final phase of the course, one student wrote: "I enjoyed this last six weeks very much mainly because of its practical application which applied not only in the classroom but in everyday life . . ." Another wrote, "Strange to say, I learned more when I took on the role of a tribeswoman than I did as an ethnographer."

Obviously all subjects cannot be taught with this same degree of overt, physical participation. Besides, the particular technique or method is not the important thing. Philip Jacob points out in *Changing Values in College*, that "on the whole, attitudes and value judgments are relatively unaffected by the manner in which students are taught. Some students may respond better to one method than another . . ." Nevertheless there is always the possibility of the teacher so identifying himself with the student that he will anticipate with ever increasing facility just how his particular area of knowledge is most meaningful, just how it must be translated into the students' interests; hooked on, if you please, to his collegiate train of thought. Jacob again points out: "It is particularly important for a teacher to understand psychological factors underlying the conflict in value systems between a student and his educational pro-

gram. He can then facilitate the learning process by providing emotional support to the student, rather than trying directly to exact a response to values which the student doesn't and probably cannot recognize."⁵ Perhaps this will have to be done, upon occasion, by the very withholding of such instruction as he has learned to expect so that he is compelled to make the identification for himself.

Once the identification is actually made, once the involvement of the student's mind and emotions with the subject in terms either of his interests on the one hand, or as a threat to them on the other, starts him thinking for himself, it would seem that the beginning of participation has been reached. Intellectual participation stimulated and kept alive by capable, challenging, crafty instruction soon culminates in the student's being taken over by self-motivated study.

(Parenthetically, the student thus motivated will find his way to the library more frequently, more regularly, and for other than social purposes. The achievement of students actually participating in a dynamic learning experience in the classroom will go a long way toward correcting many present problems in the library.)

Once such identification and participation have been achieved, other things being equal, it follows almost inevitably that standards will be raised and attitudes and values will be modified.

Without such modification as a *primary objective of good teaching*, we run the risk of supporting the trend of allowing the college trained individual to perpetuate through adulthood the standards with which he was emotionally identified as a high school graduate. The increase of knowledge

without "know-how," of information without insight, of instruction without integration, only results in tastes determined by appeal instead of discrimination, judgments without the bases of evaluation, and decisions and choices in all areas of living without reference to authority in any of them. This will only serve to enlarge the present problem of the numbers of those who prefer their own version of what constitutes, for example, good decoration without consultation of the artist, good science without the scientist, good music without the musician, a good book without knowing good literature, a good speech without knowing good rhetoric, a good sermon without knowing Bible doctrine, a good leader without knowing good leadership, and a good business transaction without understanding honest business ethics.

We as teachers must insure that the education which we provide involves learning not only how to create, but the necessity of creativity; not only how to participate in life, but the essential value of participation; not only how to identify oneself with men and ideas, but the tragedy of the barren waste in the lives of those who are incapable of so doing.

REFERENCES

- ¹ Cantor, N., *Dynamics of Learning*. Buffalo: Foster and Seart, 1946, p. 26.
- ² *Ibid.*, p. 47.
- ³ Suggested by Lurie, N. D., and J. W. M. Whiting, "A Technique for Teaching Ethnology," *American Anthropologist*, Vol. 56, No. 3, (1954), pp. 442-445.
- ⁴ Jacob, P. E., *Changing Values in College*. New York: Harper, 1957, p. 89.
- ⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 119.

Useful Education

"Few of us spend all our time or interest on the job of earning a living. We are husbands, wives, sweethearts, mothers or fathers, sons or daughters; we are members of a church, a fraternal order, a trade union, a political party; we go to movies, read newspapers, listen to the radio. We are citizens of our city, state, and nation; we are now in a real sense citizens of the world. When we speak of 'useful' education we need to ask whether it is useful in preparing us for these vocations, whether or not it will help us to participate more significantly and joyfully in the great society of which we are all members. If it prepares us for this it is vocational and useful—assuredly as is that type of education which teaches us cost accounting or mechanics."

PETER ODEGARD

Creative Logic in Freshman Composition



To use logic in teaching freshmen to write and at the same time set limits on its use is expounded by a member of the English faculty of New Mexico State University (B.A., M.A., Colorado; Ph.D., Denver). He has also contributed recently to "College English,"

"College Composition and Communication," and other journals, including articles on gifted and exceptional students.

By **WALTER J. De MORDAUNT**

PERHAPS THE PRIME ERROR that a teacher enthusiastic about logic is tempted to make in his freshman composition course is to overemphasize it. Of course, I don't mean that freshmen are paragons of consistency in their writing, but I think that the study of logic is apt to become so fascinating that everybody forgets why it is part of the course. The teacher is the greatest sinner here, because he likes to explicate, and nothing is so neatly explicable as logical structures. Therefore, perhaps we ought to plot out a few areas of composition where some rather definite logical disciplines are, at least, clearly practicable aids.

One of the big problems many freshmen run into on their first college theme is paucity of subject matter. Most of us, as teachers, have felt the students' helplessness here, have been exasperated with their lack of "imagination," have even been blamed, a little, for not being more helpful in suggesting things to write about. All we give them is a subject, or a title, and leave them to their own resources. Even after we have explained that this search for subject matter is traditionally part of the writer's job, we are apt still to feel the heat of some of that barren resentment in the back of the room, smoldering up out of inarticulate, but apparently portentous grumblings. What can we do about such agony?

We can help, I think, in a number of ways. We can show students that they have said their say in the first paragraph (or even the first sentence), and that after such an early conclusion has been arrived at, nothing is left to be proved. We can discuss logical hypotheses by a few homely illustrations, to reveal how many things must

often be investigated before the trouble is found with something mechanical, social, or ideological. If my television is on the blink, I must possibly check a hundred things before I can shoot the trouble. Of course one runs into the stubborn literal mindedness of freshmen here, but this obstacle can be hurdled by pointing out several widely different areas that our young people are interested in and letting them speculate on things they consider to be wrong with these areas. Social arrangements at school, home relationships, problems of growing up—all have their difficulties. And what we want the freshmen to do is to write about the possible reasons for these ills. It is clear that these reasons are often plural and that this plurality can give the brain racked student plenty of subject matter.

In a way, the cure is often worse than the disease because, once the tongue-tied students are channeled into the waiting ocean of ideas, they promptly flounder and sink, lying there struggling on the bottom, attempting to drown the theme reader also in a hopelessly jumbled plethora of words. But at least we have taught them how to find the ideas.

And this is, I think, a rather new approach, since "logic" is usually thought of as a critical, not a creative, instrument. Therefore, once the student begins to have ideas and to write these down, the teacher begins to function critically. Your students ought to get interested—when they are not preoccupied with getting and having ideas, when the ideas are already begotten—in allowing you to show them how the ideas can be most effectively presented.

I really think that the process of cutting a theme's wordage down to size is not at all the type of problem it is cracked up to be. In a way, cutting wordage is for the freshman a personality problem, a psychological trouble, even more so than is the creative aspect of writing. And I feel sure that many of our "exercises" in sentence structure and paragraphing are in part responsible here. When students are asked to "correct" faulty sentences and paragraphs during a long string of class periods, they begin to lose their sense of writing perspective, their feeling for emphasis, even perhaps a modicum of their inspiration. They begin to overvalue, because of this constant patchworking, not only useless, irrelevant, redundant

sentences, but the ideas contained in them.

I mention that this is a psychological problem because of this trained and irrepressible tendency to overvalue expressions which should be cut. The trouble involves the ego; one does not like to kill his brain children. And so we allow the students, with the merest of rhetorical transitions, to include all kinds of irrelevancies in their writing. Probably we fear a recurrence of the sterile imagination. But if we're interested in logic, we must counsel not infanticide but control.

We must show them that training in logic can help the writer to see that his ideas need to be proved, and that proof involves cogent, effective concatenation of ideas. In this process, students should learn to distinguish connected thinking from wandering, random daydreaming on paper. After all, we must remember that most of our freshman students have few ideas of what structured writing is. The need to prove a point, to make an idea inevitable, should excite them into taking the care necessary for good composition. We are involved here, I think, in helping to stimulate real motives for self-expression.

Another aspect of creating enthusiasm for compositional control through logical study is found when students begin to enjoy the trickiness of deduction. The separate components of forms like the syllogism and the syllogism chain can provide outlines for short, early papers, and students can thus learn to apply rather stringent molds to their early shapeless ideas. Moreover, they want to prove that they can use these shiny new tools to fashion their thoughts, and this fact adds to motives for control.

Deduction, certainly, is the area of logic which it is easy to overemphasize. One is tempted to make a course out of the disjunct, the conjunct, the hypothetical, and the alternative, not to mention the syllogism, and to let the themes take care of themselves. Here, as in the all too prevalent overemphasis on revision of faulty sentences, one focuses his attention not on creative aspects of writing, but on critical ones. And let's face it: it is easier and pleasanter to coast along, picking holes in themes, revising sentences, and trying to reshape the students' ideas into copies of our own, than it is to accept their thoughts and to help

them open their minds to the possibility of creating new ones. Patience with imperfection, rather than constant adverse criticism, is certainly the watchword here.

Freshman composition teachers, in this area of evaluating originality of idea, need, I think, more consistency and universality in our standards. The highest praise is certainly in order, wherever real inspiration turns up; almost any effective way to encourage it is the right way. But I think we teachers need to refurbish our own objective viewpoints; most of us need more of Dr. Johnson's famous capacity to argue on either side of a debatable issue. When we have this quality, our students may accuse us of inconsistency, and to these we must explain: If x is true, y is true. But we have not necessarily affirmed x to be, in fact, true. They usually understand, although we are obliged to remind them quite often of our method. And if they still don't understand, we can remind them of Emerson's hobgoblin, "consistency."

If we feel sure that inspiration is an emotional matter, we think logic can have nothing to do with it. We could not make a worse mistake, because, even when we set aside as an interesting aesthetic problem what the components of inspiration really are, our job as composition teachers remains intact. We should stop accusing ourselves of failure, when we can think of no way to teach "inspiration." Some of us will not let our students grow because we are constantly bothering them about their real convictions, in the hope that we can thus stir them to write. But these convictions, only just in the process of becoming meaningful, are delicate roots of a plant that is often very easy to kill by artificial "cultivation."

What I am saying is that to "inspire by logic" is to show the students that one is aware of, and tolerant of valid, arguable differences of opinion. Let the students write out their convictions as passionately as they will. One way to encourage them to do this is to demonstrate one's own faith that their convictions are meaningful, not to clip them in the bud by too much carping criticism. In turn, to accomplish this, we cannot let bias tie our own tongues.

Professor, Let's Get That Book



Professors frequently are charged with having many of the idiosyncrasies of genius whether they possess genius or not. Students, thirty or sixty of them, may be assigned on Monday a reference to be read "by Wednesday" when a single copy is in the library.

The head librarian of Colorado State College in the following article speaks of instances as bad or worse. He urges closer cooperation of both faculty and administration with librarians. He holds B.A. and M.A. degrees and is working toward his doctorate after over a decade in college library work.

By DANIEL A. SEAGER

ONE OF THE SORRIEST EXAMPLES of college teaching is that of the "blind" professor who asks his students to write papers on subjects about which the library has little or no materials. The mad scramble and subsequent frustrations of students, together with the throwing up of hands in despair by the library staff, are indeed a sorry sight.

What happens in such a case? Many students are led to copy papers of students of preceding days and to pass any little additional findings down to posterity. The lazy or ill-informed professor does not bother to check for plagiarism; therefore, these benighted students generally have no fears, except for some occasional pricking of a guilty conscience. And rationalization soon takes care of the problem. The students also develop an intense dislike for this professor and warn other students to stay away from "old so and so's" classes. All these things could be avoided if "old so and so" would only get himself over to the library and do some investigation in the particular areas in which he wants his students to do investigative work. When he then finds that there is much lacking, he will do well to remedy the situation by requisitioning the books and materials necessary for full enjoyment and fulfillment of

assignments on the part of his "fortunate" students.

A saying I read somewhere goes like this: "People you like to work for don't take you for granted. They don't throw work at you as if you were a machine and would turn it out automatically. When they ask you to do something, you know they have thought it over and appreciate the effort you will have to put into it." We might apply that to the professor. He should not take his students for granted; he should not take the library for granted. He should not throw work at students without first having investigated the library to see whether there are adequate materials. True, it takes time, and we realize that the first duty of a professor is not to win a popularity contest. But how much teaching would be improved if the learning process were made more satisfying not only in the classroom but also in the library!

Another "Helpful Harry" is the professor who assigns a certain library title to be read but keeps the book in his own possession. Just try to wrestle him out of it without hurting his "sensitive" feelings. And for his own students, too!

In some cases the library staff, overburdened as most staffs are, take time to send suggestions to instructors. It is a sad commentary on the teaching profession that many of these suggestions are overlooked, or just flatly ignored. True, after the situation has gone on for a while, conscientious librarians can take over the duties of less conscientious professors and order materials which would be satisfying and helpful to the students. But certainly, the teachers in any system should never be so uninterested in the welfare of their students that they themselves cannot take time to work together with the library staff and really build a good learning situation. Fortunately, the type of instructor against whom we are raving is in the minority. But I say this: When the time comes for promotions, tenure, raises, etc., among the teaching faculty, an administrator might do well to consult with his librarian before making final decisions. Perhaps improvement would come sooner than we hope, think, expect?

Should College Students Help in Schools?



Students preparing for teaching sometimes do their supervised teaching in laboratory schools which, though they are made as near like ordinary schools as practicable, are deliberately planned to differ in some respects in furtherance of their purpose as agencies of

training as well as of teaching. When such students go out into regular schools, they encounter situations such as they will deal with when they are in regular teaching jobs. How the experience may be of value alike to the student trainee, the schools, and the college is described by the director of the Educational Resources Project at Goddard College (Vermont). A Yale graduate, he has had varied experience in experimental schools and projects, and has contributed to periodicals and to the book "Community Schools in Action" by Elsie Clapp.

By **GEORGE BEECHER**

AN EXPERIMENT was begun at Goddard College in the fall of 1956 to find out whether liberal arts students could serve as assistants in rural public schools to the benefit of the schools and their own college education. The experiment has now spread to seven colleges in Vermont and Maine with aid from the Ford Foundation. If the aims can be shown to be practical and achievable, a new resource for rural schools will be at hand in many college communities throughout the country and further shifts toward responsible and independent learning will be possible in liberal arts colleges.

In two and a half years it is possible to give a mass of evidence that college students can do a great deal of useful and constructive work in assisting the rural school teacher. A capable student who is working, for example, in the field of art or science or psychology can supplement the teacher and relieve her of many tasks which she would find difficulty doing. Small groups can be handled by the assistant while the teacher concentrates on other groups. A curriculum which might otherwise consist mainly of reading, arithmetic, and "seat work" can be diversified. Many teachers are glad to have another hand to whom to

delegate the jobs of playground and physical education. College students can prepare materials, bring resources to the school, help on field trips, and serve in countless ways to reach individual children who might otherwise receive little special attention to their needs.

One teacher wrote in regard to the degree of help:

Yes, a great help. We were very fortunate to have had Earl work here at Berlin Corners. I felt that there were many excellent things about Earl that as a helper in school should be pointed out. He had great drive and consistency. He carried through his work each day with the child's welfare in mind. He understood their inner needs and gave a lot of himself to the children. I know they were very fond of him. His patience was a help even to me. He could see work to do and really made use of all the time spent here. His greatest help was his acceptance of each child for what they were and never talking down to them. The only suggestion I have for the Ford plan is to have students that are really interested in the work of teachers and the welfare of children. Thank you for helping us.

We have to picture the usual rural school (not the consolidated type) as a one-, two-, or four-room building with several grades in the same room. The equipment is meager and the teacher is hard put to accomplish more than reading and writing and arithmetic with every grade in her charge. The full advantages of social studies, science, art, music, and physical education are not immediately apparent.

SOME EXPERIENCES of Goddard students make the situation more clear and illustrate the help given:

¶ The facilities in the school for doing art work were poor, particularly in the Edwards School where the children had to run out to fetch water from a nearby brook for our water supply.

¶ The children are used to communicating with each other through their teacher. I felt that the major contribution I could make was to encourage them to talk together about their work, and when they talked of outside interests, I talked with them. The younger group in the same school was extremely orderly for their size and, in the beginning, produced tight, unimaginative work. Later they began to open up and talk with each other about what they were doing. This led to better and freer drawings.

¶ In the first grade in Mrs. Lambert's room at the beginning of the year I came across a little girl named Sherry who was painfully shy and withdrawn. When we played games and someone chose her in any way

to enter in, she would just stand petrified and shake her head. By the end of this semester Sherry was entering in our activities as actively and with the interest that the other children showed. This is not, of course, due to the small influence that I had on Sherry, but I would like to think that I helped. Of course, she showed an equally great improvement in her school work. What I did with Sherry was to do things with her after she showed signs of interest, but she was still afraid to enter in all by herself.

¶ I invited Chew Sarabhaya [a foreign student at Goddard] to speak to the Berlin Corners upper grades about Thailand. After the talk it was hard to judge who enjoyed it more, Chew or the children. I think it is marvelous that Goddard can help supply the rural school with things of this type. I wish that they would do more of it. For if there is one thing that I regard as a detriment to teaching, it is bored students. By adding some variety, the learning process improves.

One item I would like to mention was a trip the seventh and eighth grades took to the Capitol [Montpelier]. I was only in charge of the actual trip and not present at the talks that went on before or after. The children, though always well-behaved, were constantly roaming away. There is one thing I learned from this: children in rural areas get out very little and trips like these, besides being exciting and stimulating, are an important part of their growth. They might even be considered a necessity.

¶ For my Play Production class at Goddard we put on a production of a scene of *Peter Pan*. We rigged up scenery and costumes and took it to the Berlin Corners School. We let the children watch us put on our make-up and they were fascinated by the transformations (facial). They were excited by the play and wanted to do something like it. So the third and fourth grades decided on puppet shows.

¶ The first three weeks of project work were spent clearing up such simple and basic things as using the index of a book, going to the library, buying or ordering materials, finding out without being told or directed what to do next, etc. It became apparent after the second week that the resources for learning about things that interested the project groups were either lacking or superficial in depth. Although the school had an adequate supply of materials and books for the things that the adults wanted the students to learn, it was, along with the local environment, deficient in resources readily accessible to the students when it came to their interests.

IS THERE CONVINCING PROOF that these college students were gaining important values from the experience? This can be shown in examining the development of each student. The results do not appear clearly so much in marks and rankings as in attitudes, perspectives, self-knowledge, and self-testing. The report on Jane Smith indicates how the college records her development:

Jane Smith was a student who already had the qualities of stability and reliability in her college work.

She was a serious worker who did her work and met her obligations promptly and with good average intelligence. She was not very independent and not very much at ease among strangers or when a new task challenged her. She was nervous about beginning to help a capable young teacher who had a large combined class of two primary grades. The group was, as often is the case, made up of several slow, intermediate and fast clusters of children arranged in their grades by no logical order of abilities.

Jane Smith was immediately welcomed, made to feel at home, and given responsible work in helping with different groups. She began to feel she had to find out a great deal about primary school teaching—reading, arithmetic, spelling, art, music, in fact all the activities and problems of working with these ages of children. She did extra reading at college even though she had other courses which were taking her time, too. She stayed with the school through the fall semester and during the winter work period was allowed to do practice teaching in a Long Island School.

When she returned to college and to the role of assistant teacher in the second and third grade she felt she had made many discoveries about teaching and about her own needs. Very noticeable in her was a greater confidence and much greater ability to talk over plans with people in schools. She arranged her own practice teaching for the next year with the superintendent and principal in a city school and has since done very able work in that school. The teacher has cut short the observation period and allowed her to begin teaching and helping almost immediately. This case represents a student who had room to grow in becoming independent and communicative and in gaining self-confidence. She also increased her efforts to learn about teaching from books, classes and conversations with teachers and supervisors. In her case the Project appears to have given the immediate challenge to change and to make the best use of her college education. The teachers with whom she worked leave no doubt that she has been an able assistant and has relieved them of much work so that they could teach more effectively.

The experience for Jane Smith was an opening up of the learning space in which to develop. The usual college experience is to postpone responsible learning and working off campus until near or after the completion of college work. Our evidence shows that students can become more serious of purpose and responsible during their college years through a measure of service in the work of the world.

The college student also writes and speaks frankly of what happens to him and what he learns in helping a rural school, as in the following example:

This semester of teaching has been very valuable to me in that it has enabled me to understand the problem that education faces. I have now a beginning on which to make more of what I am able to do. Under-

standing the small community and its effect on the lives of its people and children has been a part of this semester's gains. I am able to work with larger groups of children than before, although it was not new to work with children. The idealistic approach to teaching I have found not workable when you have many children from many backgrounds. This came as quite a surprise to me but I found that with planning carefully each program I was able to cover the needs of the many groups within each class.

As the semester ends, I find that the time has slipped by quickly and still not so quickly as to keep me from exploring one area of study, which has meant learning to plan, organize, execute, and condense. These are the more technical aspects which I have learned. The others are a broader understanding of individual needs and talents, working with different age groups and becoming aware of the differences in their attitudes, understanding, and ability to work with or without close supervision. I sincerely hope that those people with whom I worked were able to gain at least a fraction of what I gained with this experience.

CAN WE EQUALLY WELL ESTIMATE the value of a college student's help to a school and its teachers? Besides giving more hands to the teacher and more variety to the program, are there any serious flaws in the scheme? One flaw may be in the relatively small amount of time one student can give. The Goddard students, through flexible scheduling, spend as much as two full days a week in a nearby school and help the teacher as a general assistant all day, as well as with special projects such as art or science. But we have not yet had enough students taking the course to supply each school with an assistant every day. There is no reason why a larger college could not do so. We have tried rather to reach a number of schools in the area and thus help more teachers on a part-time basis. They have had no complaint but have frequently asked for more help.

We have had such comments from teachers as the following:

¶ I certainly hope you will be able to send me students like Karyl and Steve again in the fall. I recommend them most highly as diligent, understanding and cooperative helpers.

¶ If all students do as well as Betsy did, I certainly have no suggestions. I do think Betsy is an exceptional girl. Betsy took over the music program. She helped the children with the assignments left by the music teacher and also taught the children folk songs and folk dances. One student from the college talked to the children about Mexico, another one gave an interesting art lesson. Betsy did much in creative writing. She brought in supplemental books, pictures and magazines.

¶ Our program worked very well. However, all my teachers feel weak in Art, so if there should be a student available for that subject, too, we could use someone in that field also. Susan was so quiet and well adjusted to our situation that she soon became one of our family.

¶ More—more students—more time! More men students to work, especially with children from grades five through eight. Boys of ages 10 to 16 should have experienced working with a man before entering high school.

A second flaw in the scheme of using college students in schools may be the problem of transportation. So far the Project budget has included this cost during the experimental period. A college station wagon plus student cars have been adequate. If the schools are not far, the gasoline cost is not great, but naturally increases with distance. Many rural schools might share in the cost, though we have already found the schools lacking in many more obviously needed items. This cost is probably an educational cost which is partly chargeable to the college, but partly a contribution which schools can make toward the improvement of teaching and of teacher education. The Project is an invitation for more college students to become teachers.

To balance against the problems which arise, we may consider the effects of the program on the school and college curriculum. We have already noted that the teacher in a rural school can use a great deal of help in order to increase the learning opportunities of the children. More teaching can result and more variety of studies can be offered. The teachers can do better what they would like to do, but feel unable to do either because of their own lack of training or their lack of time to prepare and carry out valuable activities in the school day.

WHAT ABOUT THE COLLEGE CURRICULUM and the college teacher? We have mentioned that students gain purpose and seriousness in doing their college work. They return from a school with questions which demand thought, action, and discussion with their college teachers. One student, for example, whose interests included both art and philosophy, presented the matter as follows:

As Suzanne Langer put it, "All the genuine, deep delight of life is in showing people the mud-pies you have made, and life is at its best when we confidently recommend our mud-pies to each other's sympathetic consideration. The creative process then, in this way, is developed to the degree where the stimulating and motivating urge to create is brought

closer in relation to the socialization process. In a situation where expression is at its fullest, the two are tied so strongly together as to become inseparable."

Is this happening in present day schools, and to what degree is it happening? Are teaching and learning really going on within the classroom? . . . To what extent is the child given an opportunity to express what is inside him, and to interact with others in the classroom situation? To what extent are the creative process and the socialization process brought to a meaningful, inseparable and active relation?

This is the same student who reported that the children had to go to the brook for water, but she added philosophically, "However, I found all these problems valuable, as thought is born of problems."

A serious question which some college teachers have raised is, can a college student afford the time to work off campus when there is so much to study on campus? The evidence I have tried to present is meant to argue this point above all else. Just how well do students use their time and how much can they gain from being put in a responsible position in the world while they are still students? The answer to these questions will be apparent at first only to college teachers and administrators who are interested in some reassessment of student time and energy, motive power to learn, and degree of involvement in learning. The concept of greater learning space implies some balance to the classroom and what the teacher expects. Other adults with whom a student works off campus may also exert much indirect pressure on learning. There is need in college for the student to know he is a person who belongs in our society during the four years of his considerable segregation for study. There are perhaps better ways to gain recognition than in extra-curricular clubs, activities, and competitive sports.

The effect of this experiment on the college curriculum so far is twofold. It has made clear the fact that students gain in strength of purpose

and in knowledge of their own strengths or weaknesses. They understand the realities of education from a new point of view. They test their sense of values and their classroom learning in practice; they try themselves out as potential teachers under favorable conditions; and they see in clearer light the problem of their own learning from their own teachers.

The experiment also suggests that other areas in the college curriculum are open to similar study and field work. Students can engage in many off campus learning experiences where special help is needed. Already other teachers have found opportunities in working with state institutions which have many research or manpower problems where students in social sciences are able to contribute. Similar opportunities may be found in agriculture, conservation, health, political science, to mention a few.

Why should we hold back the liberal arts student if he can do useful work while learning? Further testing of the idea will be needed to know more about the selection and guidance of the work of able students in the field. But the experiment so far has shown that the college student is responsible enough and capable enough to learn better from teachers while having off campus experience. It is actually important for the student to bring as much of his own experience as possible to the teacher. When a student is helped to work independently he finds out how to use a teacher better. The teacher, on his part, is closer to the student because they share responsibility for a job to do.

This may not alter many of the methods and arrangements of the college lecture, classroom, and examination system, but it may insert by some small door the concept of a close relation with a teacher who can follow what is really happening to a student in college and so can help him to learn and to know himself in relation to that learning.

The Next Issue

The Summer 1960 issue will be out in June with articles by E. Jackson Baur, University of Kansas; Charles I. Glicksberg, Brooklyn College; Wilbert J. McKeachie and Elton B. McNeil, University of Michigan; Frederick Mayer, University of Redlands; Ordway Tead; James R. Woodworth, Miami University; James D. Young and Pearl L. Ward, Los Angeles State College of Applied Arts and Sciences. Television and other modes of teaching will be featured. Editorial: "The Professor and His Guests."

Could We Cut Costs the Soviet Way?



We welcome again to our pages an earlier contributor to this journal, both to the first volume in 1953 and a second time five years ago. The author has now been to Russia in the Comparative Education Society's five week summer seminar last fall in Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev, and Tashkent. We wish we could see, and present to our readers, the 500 colored slides and 1,200 feet of movie film he brought back. A professor of education (A.B., Dartmouth; A.M., Ph.D., Yale), he has served at North Texas State College and since 1955 at the University of Oklahoma.

We wish we could see, and present to our readers, the 500 colored slides and 1,200 feet of movie film he brought back. A professor of education (A.B., Dartmouth; A.M., Ph.D., Yale), he has served at North Texas State College and since 1955 at the University of Oklahoma.

By CHESTER S. WILLIAMS

WHILE VISITING institutes, universities, and the Ministry of Higher Education in the Soviet Union for five weeks this summer, members of the Seminar on Soviet Education of the Comparative Education Society were enlightened, albeit in a sporadic manner, on some of the interesting facets of Soviet higher education. The following hints on cost cutting while not entirely accurate convey the general tenor of one phase of undergraduate higher education in the Soviet Union.

HINT 1: LOW ENROLLMENTS

Should we reduce the numbers of full time students? According to Boris Gerashenko, Vice Minister of the Ministry of Higher Education for the U.S.S.R., there are over two and one-half million students in higher education in the Soviet Union. However, in addition to useful work 'available' in the Virgin Lands and other delightful vacation spots, part-time work on the farm and in the factory will soon be the rule rather than the exception, according to Boss Khrushchev. Only in the last two years, for the most part, will a student be permitted to study full time and then only in the sciences. Consequently, few Soviet college students are full timers, although these enrolled in teacher education may be an exception.

Two reasons explain the new switch to the work-study plan in higher education and soon to follow on the secondary level: one is the need for

technicians and general labor; the other, to assure that the younger generation "loves labor with all its heart." Today one can find students of college age who like to play a little and who would like to question. They do so silently or in strict confidence, for despite Anastas Mikoyan's insistence that the police state is a relic in the Soviet Union, one hears such statements as this: "Please do not telephone us. The wires are controlled."

Should we require prior work or service experience? Today supposedly over eighty percent of the Soviet college students have worked in the farm or factory for two years or have done their stint in military service for a like period. Soviet educators hold that aside from learning to love labor, to adequately learn the practical and thus obtain a basic ingredient of his general education, the late teenager has an opportunity to discover his own potentialities. Theoretically, then, many counsel themselves out of college before starting it.

Yet the desire for higher education should not be minimized. Life is much more bearable in the Soviet Union with a degree, call it extrinsic motivation if you will. And among the general populace the search for "knowledge," as the Soviets understand the term, is a sight to behold. One wishes that the desire might be exportable.

Should we maintain a stiff upper entrance exam? Many students believe they are called, but few are chosen. Last year, for example, there were nearly four times as many applications as vacancies. Nor can one always major in the field of his primary interest.

One may flunk his Russian language proficiency test, or he may fail the subject matter specialization exam in his chosen field. He need not fail both to be denied admission. Usually he must wait another year before trying again, because for the most part entrance exams are given at the same time in different universities.

Even if the student comes from a home where Russian is not the native tongue, he is expected long since to have mastered it. There are no "slow" freshman Russian sections in which he may enroll.

Luck may be with him, however, when he takes the exam in the area in which he wishes to major, for he draws at least some of the questions from a basket. And he may have the edge over another student obtaining the same scores, in the event that he has been a gold medal winner

while in secondary school. Incidentally, the student or his family are supposedly punished if they try to seek influence concerning entrance, but evidence indicates that favoritism for party members exists in housing priorities, so why not in this respect also?

Nor will it behoove the student to head for the entrance exam file in the fraternity house. In the first place, there is no fraternity house—only meetings of the Komsomols (the Young Communist Party, an outfit not too simple to crack for membership). In the second place, there is no file. The exams are all the essay type and are not returned permanently to the student, although he is apprised of the results.

Should we take it easy on honor stipends?

Another device employed to keep enrollment relatively low—but designed to stimulate students to do their best work—is to make it impossible for many students to receive the honor "allowance" and have his picture placed on the red velvet bulletin board. Nearly all students receive the basic stipend of two hundred rubles monthly (approximately the equivalent of twenty American dollars) in addition to free board and room and transportation home during the shorter vacations. The student usually receives the same amount or a trifle more in the summer while working with his peers in such an erstwhile endeavor as clearing the "virgin lands," "where they are only too willing to go"—except that this isn't how some students explain it. In the event of illness the amount may also be provided while the student remains in a rest camp or at home under the watchful eye of a physician.

One needs almost a straight Five (A) average to hit the jackpot but, on the other hand, the longer he stays in college the greater his allowance becomes, although never approaching the amount of the honor stipend. The student council decides the amounts, but the Director issues the orders regarding who is to be dropped because of scholastic inefficiency.

One rapid way to be scratched is to cut classes (lectures). "We have no eternal students," forcefully remarked the Vice Minister of Higher Education. He has no eternal faculty members, either, unless they are politically loyal and otherwise worthy, for each five-year period sees the college professor competing by examination for his own position.

Should we break students' backs with a sixty hour week? Overwork is another factor calculated

to ascertain that only the best students complete the program and reflects the terrific competition which characterizes the total educational pattern at all levels. All students since their three year kindergarten days have been accustomed to the six day school week, heavy extracurricular duties, and Union financed and Party operated camps for Octoberists and Young Pioneers, but the college class and outside assignment load is mighty heavy, indicated by administrators to be close to sixty, if not on the button.

Conversations with students generally uphold this heavy schedule. A picture of tough minded and unyielding professors also emerges, some students even saying, "You have no idea how unkind they can be." (I could have said a word or two in response regarding my own reactions as a one-time U. S. college student, but being a college professor and knowing that such situations no longer exist—indeed, if they ever did—I remained silent (?))

Should we hold undergraduates to a five year plan and a thesis? Many students attend institutes of a vocational or semivocational nature (nursing, teaching in the nursery, kindergarten or lowest grades, etc.), but the bulk of students heading for professions are in a five-year program and slightly more, in the case of physics. This is a gruelling academic program, even with today's practical experience during the first two years. Soon it will be much more so.

The diploma project would take the starch out of most U. S. undergrads, with its independent work, long hours, hard toil, and many anxious moments. The preliminary practicum wherein the thesis is proposed is demanding enough, but the defense itself, occurring in a 'gala atmosphere with the official opponent taking the floor,' would be devastating to one who has not before engaged in rigid competitions, existing in a society where, since his kindergarten days, in the classroom he has been regularly assigned 'little tasks' to perform.

How the typical American undergraduate would react when a jam-packed audience, informed of the event by newspaper announcements, was on hand for the presentation of the diploma project, would be interesting indeed. It must be a tense moment as one receives the verdict from an eleven- or thirteen-member state committee ("We want no tie votes"), an outside examiner having first completed his role!

HINT 2: KEEP COUNSELING OVERHEAD LOW

Should we rely on others to identify talent?

In a nation where waifs at age six are selected to be educated in orphanages specializing in various skills, such as music, or dance, it is no wonder that college guidance services are not needed to put their finger on the gifted. Constant contests and competitions have long since eliminated the major portion of the unfit. In the case of the orphanages, however, it is largely a question of identifying the parents' skills. If your mother were a talented ballerina, for example, you wouldn't wind up in an art orphanage.

Should we minimize counseling by faculty members? A college not devoted to counseling will not expend much time, effort, or money in this direction. Believing only in mechanistic psychology almost totally 'a la Pavlov,' Soviet graduate students, some of them Party members, have approximately ten undergraduates as their advisees.

A 'good' Soviet adviser is opposed to Freudian, Jungian, or any other 'foreign' theory of psychoanalysis, holding no brief either for field psychology, group dynamics, and so on. ("This may be all right in your educational system," one hears, "but it is not in ours. We have no Freudians here.") It is easy to see that counseling students in Soviet colleges is not a difficult task.

Should we eliminate standardized tests and forms? "There is no need to expend rubles for file cabinets when one does not need to keep many records. Standardized tests are undemocratic because they place labels on students and divide them into classes. The only form we need to keep is the final one, and it goes to the employer. The graduate delivers it in person. The professors make their own examinations, and we therefore need not save them." So run paraphrased remarks in response to a typical Western question regarding records and forms.

It is no wonder that one would have to employ Sherlock Holmes to locate a Soviet mimeograph machine!

Should we use students for the real counseling responsibility? Counseling in the area of social competence is relegated to one's peers. Actually, this practice is to be expected not because it costs nothing but because ever since the student has been seven years old his Octoberist or Young Pioneer classmates have been 'helping' him to become a good citizen, prodding him if he has let his homework slide, pressuring him into taking

an active part in extracurricular and summer camp activities where he learns to become a working member of the collective. Now the Komsomol takes over. In the words of Madame Toshieva Kalavdga, Chairlady of the Departments of Kinetics and Chemistry, the State University of Moscow, "The Komsomol representatives, the Student Trade Union representatives, and the professors of the department meet together to look at the student's social competencies. Then the professors tell him about the results of his academic work. Once each year the records are kept up." Occasionally, however, faculty members 'revolt,' trying to hold good academic students deemed 'unworthy' by their peers. Of course, one might as well try to beat down the Kremlin walls with his bare hands.

It is not unusual that the student, therefore, is cautioned by his adviser in this fashion, in the words of Madame Kalavdga, "You should improve in these matters because otherwise I shall have to place the Komsomol's remarks on your record, and you know that this record—kept up once each year—is weighed heavily by an employer because he wants a good moral person for a worker and a good member of the collective."

What happens to the students who do not 'identify' in the proper manner? "Well," said the same department head, "in the event that the student is merely immature, we just reprimand him a little and scare him just a trifle the way we all as teachers do sometimes. But if a student truly evidences a poor state of mind, we would then send him to work as an engineer in order that he might learn to understand his faults and appreciate the collective. We deliberately give such a person disinteresting tasks in the factory; in this way he may learn to appreciate what has been done for him and how we have provided him with a free education and with a stipend."

It is no wonder that some students, detesting being spied upon and even awakened during the night to have their rooms searched, move out of the dorms and even relinquish their stipend and go to work, continuing their education on a part time basis.

Yet, on the credit side, if a student's health is poor and he is considered worthy, the university provides a special living area on the college grounds where he may receive the proper diet and adequate rest. In addition, supposedly a special committee oversees the student's living conditions, no matter where he lives.

AMERICAN WASTEFULNESS

Of course, the dialectical materialist views American higher education through rose colored glasses. Just as you have your point of view, he has his. Why do Americans 'mother' college students on the one hand and permit free electives on the other? Not realizing that the movement toward cafeteria style course offerings has been modified in this nation in recent years, in many instances free electives becoming handcuffed, Soviet educators think it strange that we employ professors who are supposed to possess the truth—American style—and then permit the students to select what they want to study.

Accordingly, they view our academic counseling services as utter nonsense. In the Soviet mind one takes what is prescribed in the fields in which it has been decided he can do his best work, of course in an area where manpower is needed. Academic advising where almost all courses are prescribed is not difficult.

Marx and Lenin did not possess the counseling point of view and therefore wrote nothing about it upon which the Ministry of Higher Education or the Academy of Pedagogical Science could issue regulations. Consequently, the practice of American personnel guidance procedures is viewed by Marxists as both nonsensical and decadent. Instead, students should help each other. Faculty members should teach.

Defects in personality, as well as physical

handicaps, are organic in origin. Therefore, rest, medicine, proper diet, and health camps for more drastic cases are considered to be much more effective than psychotherapeutic sessions. Besides, these devices are intended to bring guilt feelings to the surface. And with our healthful environment we have none to be raised.

COMMON GROUND IS SPARSE AND SHAKY

If great chasms exist between our points of view there are still some areas held in common by Soviet and American college teachers.

Both groups hold that Sputnik I excited so much interest in that teachers needed further education to satisfy youthful curiosity. Both consider the secondary school to be negligent in preparing students for college. Furthermore, both hold that their colleagues in the field of education are not so well qualified as are their peers in the "more academic disciplines."

Both groups view the development of the individual within the framework of his society as a task of paramount importance. Motivation and effective techniques of instruction, particularly pertaining to the lecture, even more emphasized in the Soviet Union than in the United States, a fact possibly difficult to believe, are pedagogical aspects of marked interest in both instances.

One fascinating question suggests itself: Are the Soviets more successful in educating for social competence in their society than we are in ours?

"College Teachers Should Inspire their Students to Aspire"

"It is no longer popular to suggest that college teachers should inspire their students to aspire. Yet this has always been the heart of general education. It continues to be the heart. Delve into the intimate history of almost any great man and of almost any civic-minded citizen and you will find at least one inspiring teacher who has helped arouse him to his larger self. Only when college teachers return to the ancient ideal of inspiring teaching can they hope to improve the self-realization of their students and to help them synthesize the contradictory claims of physical, social, and vocational purposes—and of selfishness and unselfishness. The agency of this synthesis must be good teaching."

W. H. COWLEY

Graduate Schools and Teaching

A Review by E. D. DURYEY

THE GRADUATE SCHOOL AND THE DECLINE OF LIBERAL EDUCATION by Earl J. McGrath. New York: Institute of Higher Education, Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University. 1959. 65 pp.

IN a well written, clearly organized, and very persuasive pamphlet, Dr. McGrath has highlighted a problem basic to modern higher education: the almost total concern of graduate schools for specialized research despite the increasingly desperate need of undergraduate colleges for teaching scholars.

Dr. McGrath first of all calls upon the liberal arts colleges to throw off the shackles of conventional graduate education and reaffirm their own traditional function of leadership in American society. He proposes that specialized instruction in the college should give way to "comprehensive courses embracing the facts, principles, and intellectual procedures employed in a wide range of subject matter and applicable to a host of complex social and political problems." This is intended as a corrective of a development that has gone too far:

Specialized and professionally slanted instruction in the academic departments disestablished the conception of a liberal education as a definite body of knowledge. . . . The liberal arts college, however, must regain and affirm a clear, feasible, and independent mission.

He urges that graduate and undergraduate education be separated, and that the teacher of undergraduates be given a road ahead separate from that now bounded by specialized investigation and publication.

Graduate schools should be able to devote their efforts more effectively to their two equal but somewhat different responsibilities: the preparation of graduate students to teach and the preparation of investigators.

In his historical analysis of relationships between graduate and undergraduate education and his stress upon the differences between these two functions, Dr. McGrath's thinking follows that of Professor W. H. Cowley of Stanford University, who has been stressing this distinction in his writings and talks for the past decade.

Unquestionably, this pamphlet strikes at a problem which will become increasingly pressing

in the decade ahead. Some misgivings may be felt concerning the author's continuing stress upon the role of the graduate school in undermining traditional liberal education and the importance of a return to the liberal arts college of the 19th century. Rather, it would seem sounder to stress the fact that conditions in the mid-20th century differ substantially from those in the mid-19th century. The university structure, the graduate school stress upon scholarship, and the specialization of subject matter in American higher education reflected German influences. But they also developed as a reaction against the intellectual sterility of the early colleges, their limited classical curriculum, and their failure to challenge students. These deficiencies are described, for example, in a recent biography of Mark Hopkins.

It would seem also that Dr. McGrath's proposed general education rests upon an integration of the knowledge which the universities and their graduate schools have contributed. It takes up where they leave off rather than returns to what used to be.

Other New Books

A HISTORY OF EDUCATIONAL THOUGHT by Frederick Mayer. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc. 1960. xi + 494 pp. \$6.95.

Much more than a chronicle, this comprehensive volume presents a discerning interpretation, not so much of institutions and movements but of the ideas and philosophies that have shaped education in this country at all levels from nursery school to graduate school. The author says he has "tried to reveal the impact on education of the philosophical ideas not only of Christians, but also of Mohammedans, and of the ancient Chinese, Greeks, and Indians. The Orient can teach us the virtue of contemplation which we need desperately in our atavistic culture." It is hoped that, in lieu of a review, we can present in the Summer issue of this journal some excerpts from this significant book.

EDUCATION AND MORAL WISDOM by George N. Shuster. Foreword by Ordway Tead. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1960. ix + 146 pp. \$3.50.

"A sensitive, devout, learned, and widely ranging personality—his utterances reflect the man in at once an accurate and a noble manner."

GENERAL EDUCATION: AN ACCOUNT AND APPRAISAL edited by Lewis B. Mayhew. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1960. viii + 212 pp. \$4.00.

"A guide for college faculties." Chapters by Lewis B. Mayhew, W. Hugh Stickler, Russell M. Cooper, Sidney J. French, Marjorie Carpenter, B. Lamar Johnson, James L. McKenney, Paul L. Dressel. These authors "describe theory, programs, and practices which in their judgment have proved effective."

PROLOGUE TO TEACHING by Marjorie B. Smiley and John S. Diekhoff. New York: Oxford University Press. 1959. viii + 590 pp. \$5.75.

"Readings and source materials with text." No attempt to provide a systematic history of education. From first century Quintilian to contemporary Henry Steele Commager, one hundred and thirty-three challenging, controversial, and memorable writings are presented, with interpretative introductions.



A College President: "The finest workshop I have been privileged to attend."

You have heard about this West Coast

College and University Teaching WORKSHOP

This is your invitation to participate.

- ▶ STAFF and facilities developed through 18 years experience in College and University Teaching seminar offerings are fully utilized in the Workshop.
- ▶ Resource persons of national reputation, including Workshop members themselves.
- ▶ A cooperative enterprise: Each person has his own desk and works on topics of concern to him. Workshop room is provided with special facilities and materials for Workshop activities. Each worker is associated with others from many states and institutions and of widely differing disciplines, but all with a common interest in college teaching. Director guides and coordinates and resource persons enrich discussions.
- ▶ Orientation in College and University Teaching in areas of Evaluation, Aims, Procedures, Outcomes, Professional Interests and Relationships.
- ▶ Individual and group projects pursued by reading, analysis, observation, discussion.
- ▶ Special projects for advanced Workshop members: Leadership of Faculty In-Service Improvement, Independent Study, Evaluation, Superior Students.

Fifth Year

Two Weeks

August 1-12, 1960

Fee \$31.50

Three quarter hours of graduate credit may be earned at no extra cost. Advance correspondence with the Director of the Workshop is desirable.

Workshop members register for CC 508. Workshop: College and University Teaching.

For additional information and reservation write to

**GRADUATE SCHOOL
Oregon State College
Corvallis, Oregon**

Published by State Board of Higher Education

"I gained: knowledge, appreciation, inspiration, acquaintance, insight, plus three hours of graduate credit."



60

e credit
Advance
of the

er for
and Uni-

dit."